DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 162 223 CG 012 976

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Project: Family and Community Studies (FACS). Final Report. |
| INSTITUTION | Southwest Educational Development Lab., Austin, Tex. |
| SPONS AGENCY | National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. |
| PUB DATE | 78 |
| GRANT | NIE-G-78-0108 |
| NOTE | 294p.; For related document see CG 012 975 |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Community Programs; *Family Life Education; Parent Child Relationship; *Parent Education; Pilot Projects; *Program Development; *Program Planning |

ABSTRACT

The parenting and education functions of families, in the context of their homes and communities, are explored. The literature on parent education is reviewed, and a preliminary survey of a number of ongoing parent education programs is conducted. The tasks undertaken were designed to provide a solid theoretical and empirical foundation for carrying out proposed research, development and service goals. Ongoing goals and objectives for the project are outlined, and specific instruments utilized during the study are included. It is hoped that this project will build a base of information that would be valuable in the development of programs for parents, caretakers, school and community personnel. (KA)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED162223

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: CG | PS

In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lois Belvoit

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 East 7th Street, Austin, Texas 78701

512/476-6861

May 26, 1978

Dr. Oliver Moles, Head
School Social Relations
National Institute of Education
Washington, D.C. 20208

Dear Dr. Moles:

Submitted herewith is the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory's final report for Project: Family and Community Studies (FACS) in the Division of Community and Family Education. This report is in compliance with the terms and conditions of Grant No. OB-NIE-G-78-0108, which ends on May 31, 1978.

The activities and findings from this initial effort represent what SEDL feels is a useful contribution to education in general and to parenting, parent education and parent involvement in particular. We look forward to continuing our studies in this area.

We shall be pleased to discuss this report and provide you with additional information, if requested.

Sincerely yours,

James H. Perry

James H. Perry
Executive Director

jm

xc: Dr. Robert Chesley
Mr. Raymond Wormwood

CG 012476

SEDL

FINAL REPORT

PROJECT: FAMILY AND COMMUNITY STUDIES (FACS)

Senior Researcher: Dr. Renato Espinoza

Staff: Emylou Alvarez
Gail Brown*
Andrea Meditch*
Susan Heck*
George Torres*

Funded Period: 11/1/77 - 5/31/78

In Compliance with Grant No. OB-NIE-G-78-0108

Funded by: National Institute of Education
Washington, D.C.

David L. Williams, Jr., Director
Division of Community and Family Education

James H. Perry, Executive Director
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
Austin, Texas

GG 012976

*Not employed full time in Project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| | A. Purpose | 1 |
| | B. Need | 1 |
| | C. Long Range Goal and Objectives | 5 |
| | D. The Activities (Tasks) to be Completed in Phase I (November 1, 1977 - May 31, 1978) | 6 |
| | 1. Review of the Literature | 6 |
| | 2. Pilot Test and Revision of Survey | 6 |
| | 3. Survey Data Storage and Retrieval System | 7 |
| | E. Project Modifications | 7 |
| II. | PARENT EDUCATION AND PARENT EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN THE LITERATURE | 11 |
| | A. Scope of the Literature Review and Review Procedures | 11 |
| | 1. Identification | 11 |
| | 2. Document Classification | 12 |
| | 3. Preliminary Review | 14 |
| | 4. Data Reduction | 15 |
| | B. Parent Roles | 17 |
| | C. From Parent Education to Parent Involvement and Back Again | 19 |
| | D. The Evidence for Effectiveness of Parent Education | 26 |
| | 1. Parent Roles in Educationally-Based Programs | 27 |
| | 2. Evidence for Effectiveness of Educationally-Based Parent Education Programs | 28 |
| | 3. Evidence for Effectiveness in Non-Educationally-Based Parent Education Programs | 38 |
| | E. The Evidence for the Range and Variety of Parent Education Programs | 40 |
| | 1. Goals and Objectives for Parents | 42 |
| | 2. Goals and Objectives for Children | 43 |
| | 3. Eligibility, Recruitment, Program Base | 48 |
| | 4. Delivery/Method of Instruction | 49 |
| | 5. Staff | 54 |
| | 6. Evaluation | 55 |
| | 7. Summary | 60 |
| | F. Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations | 62 |
| III. | A SURVEY OF PARENT EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN AUSTIN | 74 |
| | A. Objectives of the Survey | 74 |
| | B. Development of the Survey Instrument | 74 |
| | C. Locating Parent Education Programs and Respondents | 76 |

PAGE

D. Description of Local Parent Education Programs..... 78
E. Recommendations for A Comprehensive Survey of Parent Education Programs..... 84

1. Locating Programs and Respondents..... 85
2. Generating Information About Programs..... 87

a. Describing Program Operations..... 88
b. Describing Program Personnel Characteristics..... 90
c. Describing the Characteristics of Parent Education Leaders..... 92

BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 93

APPENDICES

Appendix A:

Coding Sheet: School-Based Education
Coding Sheet: Non-School Based Education
Program Data Sheet

Appendix B:

Brief Descriptions of Parent Education Programs

Appendix C:

Dimensions of Parent Education Programs
Preliminary Draft of Parent Education Survey Questionnaire
Parent Education Pilot Interview

Appendix D:

Parent Education Programs in Austin, Texas
Austin Programs: Interviews Completed
Interview Summaries

Appendix E:

Sample Interview Transcript

Appendix F:

Drafts of Instruments:

Program Description Questionnaire
Parent Education Program Staff Questionnaire
Parent Education Leader Interview Topics

TABLES AND FIGURE


Table 1 Parental Roles in Recent Reviews of Research

Table 2 Stated Goals for Parents in Service-Oriented Programs

Table 3 Stated Goals for Children in Service-Oriented Programs

Table 4 Program Location Base of Service-Oriented Programs

Table 5 Instructor for Service-Oriented Programs

Table 6 Delivery/Method of Instruction of Service-Oriented Programs

Table 7 Characteristics of Program Staff of Service-Oriented Programs

Table 8 Size of Program Staff of Service-Oriented Programs

Table 9 Evaluation Focus and Procedures of Service-Oriented Programs

---

Figure 1 Theoretical Continuum of Parent Interaction with the Educational System

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose: During the seven month's period from November 1, 1977 to May 31, 1978 (NIE Grant #OB-NIE-G-78-0108) Project FACS undertook to prepare for an in depth study of the parenting and education functions of families in the context of their homes and communities. This exploratory effort consisted of an examination of the literature on parent education and a preliminary survey of a number of ongoing parent education programs. The purposes of these activities were to (1) provide an up-to-date picture of existing parent education program research and (2) develop methods of gathering information to describe currently existing parent education programs and projects designed to provide support to families in their parenting and educational functions. By examining models of and approaches to parent education programs in the literature, FACS hoped to identify areas where additional research was needed. Then, utilizing the knowledge obtained on existing programs, FACS would be able to select suitable targets for a more in depth examination of parent education program problems in the SEDL region. The tasks undertaken during this seven month period were designed to provide a solid theoretical and empirical foundation for carrying out proposed research, development and service goals projected for FACS during the next five years.

B. Need: Continuity, congruity, match or mismatch between values and practices of the child's home and the school's social system are powerful predictors of school adjustment and educational attainment. Children's early experiences in the family, and the degree of family support for their participation in the formal educational system are important factors in determining school adjustment and educational success.

A reciprocal relationship exists between home and school. Throughout the child's school career, the home continues to be a key element for support and reinforcement of school-promoted outcomes, values and practices. On the other hand, through the child and often in direct outreach activities, the school tries to effect changes in children and their family life.

When both school and home hold similar values and "speak the same language," their interactions and relationships usually are seen as harmonious, legitimate and mutually reinforcing. When language and/or values differ, however, communication can break down and the school can be perceived as not responsive to the needs of some or most of its clients -- children and their families.

Both the educational and sociological literature have documented the mismatch between prior socialization and school demands in low income and minority group populations. The poor quality of children's school experiences often leads to a career of small failures that build into larger failures, including school drop out and delinquency. A majority of the studies which document home and school mismatches were concerned with school achievement and intelligence scores. "Cultural deprivation" and a "culture of poverty" were proposed as intervening variables which attempted to explain the relationship between family background and school failure. Many of the earlier federal compensatory educational programs were designed to make up for home-based deficiencies before the child started school.

The culture of poverty literature has come under increasing attack from a number of sources. Sociologists, anthropologists, scholars, and educators involved in multicultural/bilingual education are concerned

with the validity of a model which posits that a given culture is deficient. Individual researchers are looking more carefully at strengths of families in low income communities and at adaptive mechanisms which can help facilitate families' abilities to cope with and succeed in their environments.

The research efforts of Project FACS proposed to focus on two family functions: (1) the primary responsibility for child rearing that takes place from birth on, and (2) the secondary responsibility for the child's education, which begins with the enrollment of the child in the formal educational system. The family role in the education of children is usually considered to be of a secondary nature, one of supporting and reinforcing the efforts of agencies (schools) that are entrusted with the primary responsibility for educating the children.

Child-rearing and education differ in terms of the temporal sequence in which they take place, the people who have primary responsibility for each, and the intended outcomes. The child-rearing function during the early years is considered to be a primary responsibility of the family, in particular of the parents. It has as a goal to produce relatively competent, autonomous individuals, capable of taking care of themselves, interacting with others, communicating in the oral language of their community, and profiting from additional experiences which they become eligible for when they reach school age.

The formal education of children usually takes place in later childhood and is considered to be the primary responsibility of schools. It has as a goal to prepare the individual to function as a productive member of the society. The traditional separation between child-rearing and education has been challenged lately by a change in thinking with

respect to when "schooling" should begin. This is evidenced by the increasing availability of kindergarten programs and the significant growth of preschool programs designed for even younger children. The need for parents' participation in and responsibility for this early education is thought to be greater than it is for later schooling, but even there expanded efforts are made to recruit parents and older siblings in a supporting role to the school-based activities. The extension of education to the younger years has been accompanied by a greater participation by educational and non-educational institutions and agencies in providing parent education.

Thus, schools have become active in facilitating the involvement of parents in educational and training experiences that are expected to help them smooth the transition between home and school. These efforts of the school to change the home have been accompanied by pressures from parents to make schools more responsive to the special needs of their children, both in terms of (1) curriculum, methods, language and (2) special services for special populations, e.g., bilingual, migrant, and handicapped students.

Families do not exist in isolation; many other institutions in the community, both educational and non-educational, affect the ways in which families perform their functions. The family is viewed as an integral and interactive part of a complex of networks, institutions and systems (usually referred to as the community) that constitute the environment in which the parenting function takes place. In order to help bring about better relationships between home and school, thereby enhancing the lives of children, a need exists to increase the understanding of the relationships between these various individuals and groups.

FACS proposed to deal with this need by studying and analyzing parent education programs as means for developing more effective interactions and actions on the part of home and schools in providing for the well-being of children.

C. Long Range Goal and Objectives:

1. The overall goal of Project FACS is to contribute to the enhancement of the contexts in which children grow and develop--family, school and community. Project FACS hopes to build a base of information that would be valuable to develop programs to support those who are the important people in these contexts--parents, caretakers, school and community personnel.

2. The general objectives proposed for FACS during the next five years are as follows:

- To identify the institutions and agencies that influence the competence with which the family carries out its functions.
- To understand the mechanisms by which educational and non-educational institution in the community influence the parenting and educational functions of the family.
- To understand the nature of the reciprocal influences between family and school and the factors that affect the nature, degree, and intensity of these reciprocal influences.
- To identify and describe specific programs designed to support family functions in parenting and education.
- To identify, develop and assist in the implementation of educational practices, programs and policies that increase the competency of the family to rear and assist in the education of children.

- To provide decision-makers and the public with up-to-date information and sound research findings in the area of family support in order to set policies, priorities and delivery systems for these services.

D. The Activities (Tasks) to be completed in Phase I (November 1, 1977-May 31, 1978) were as follows:

1. Review of the literature. A comprehensive review of social science literature was to be performed. Tentative general areas included examination of family-social environment relationships, family support agency relationships and family support systems in general. Descriptions and evaluations of programs and experiences in parent/family involvement in education were to be reviewed to identify models and/or types of participatory mechanisms, criteria for success or effectiveness, impact on the participant, the children and the educational institution.

Special attention was to be given to current literature on families and communities characterized by low socio-economic levels, minority group membership, and one-parent and working mother families. The review was to help identify special conditions under which family support is most critical and it was to point to the most promising agencies/delivery systems. This would guide the selection of families, communities and programs to be studied in depth in the later phases of the FACS effort.

Product: A document outlining the approaches and models proposed in the literature which describes the role of community institutions and agencies in support of the parenting and educational function of the family.

2. Pilot test and revision of survey. A survey was to be designed and carried out in a limited area to identify and describe programs and ac-

tivities designed to support the parenting function and to promote parent involvement in the education of children. This included development of both the strategies to locate and identify the specific programs and the actual survey instrument to gather information about the programs. This information was to include target for the program, goals, sponsoring agency, staffing, funding, specific objectives, etc.

Products: A set of well-defined strategies for identifying and contacting programs. A reliable and valid pilot tested survey form.

3. Survey data storage and retrieval system. The information generated by survey was to be coded, reduced, summarized, and stored in the form of an expanding data base. The goal was to design a system to keep and update the information about the programs identified in the state and region for dissemination and technical assistance purposes in later phases of this project.

Product: A data storage and retrieval system to handle current and projected survey information to be gathered in later stages.

E. Project Modifications

The goals and objectives outlined above correspond to the five-year plan formulated for Project FACS. The specific tasks and objectives for the current seven month period were proposed as outlined above to NIE and were later modified in direct conversations with the Project Officer and other NIE staff and consultants. The major modifications of the scope of work resulted in a more restricted literature review, which concentrated efforts on locating and assessing the conceptual and research literature dealing with parent education programs, regardless of who sponsored them or where they were located. The decision to focus on parent education rather than on parent involvement was based on the exam-

ination of a continuum of parent interactions with the educational system developed by FACS and used in the course of discussions with NIE staff (see Figure 1). The components of the continuum are not separate entities or distinguishable units. The continuum is a schematic representation of a continuous flow of activity and reflects a rising level of sophistication, competence as parents and individuals, and organized power and participation of the public in the educational system and American society. It also reflects a rising level of responsiveness of educational institutions. Most parent education programs are organized so that the flow of influence goes from the educational institution to parents. In some parent involvement programs, however, parents are involved in the decision-making process vis-à-vis the institutions, so that influence flows in the other direction. Between these two is a transitional type of program where parents and the educational institution cooperate on more of a shared basis. The chart reproduced as Figure 1 reflects this continuum of parent interactions with the educational system.

The decision was made to eliminate literature dealing with parent (citizen) participation in governance, since it was beyond the areas of interest and expertise of the Project staff. In addition, it was decided that the main thrust of the review would be on literature pertinent to parent education programs. The decision to focus on parent education rather than on parent involvement was based on the fact that parent education programs are not limited to educational institutions. Unlike parent involvement, which is based exclusively within educational institutions, parent education programs span a range of contexts which include both educational and non-educational settings. Because the pri-

FIGURE 1
THEORETICAL CONTINUUM OF PARENT INTERACTIONS WITH THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

| | PARENT EDUCATION<br>PARENT AS RECIPIENT OF INFORMATION, DIRECTION OR TRAINING (Institution Directed) | PARENT INVOLVEMENT<br>PARENT AS ACTIVE, INVOLVED PARTICIPANT (Institution & Parents as Active Co-Participants) | PARENT (CITIZEN) CONTROL<br>PARENT-DIRECTED INVOLVEMENT-PARTICIPATION (Parents as Change Agents, Institution As Recipient) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Parental Input: | Low level of parental input to schools (through institution-directed service to school might be high); direct parental contribution to school-based educational process; no contribution to social change | Moderate to high level of give-and-take interactions with schools and education experts; moderate to high level of parental contribution to school-based educational process; possibility exists of some parental contribution to institution or social change | High level of parental input to or impact on school; high level of indirect parental impact on school-based education process; direct parental contribution to institution-social change |
| Impact Target: | Individual parent or parent groups. (Generally in line with psychological approach: concern with individual adjustment) | Mutual impacting of parents & schools. Potential exists for power struggle. (More in line with sociological approach--concern with impact of social environment on people) | Institution or larger society. (Social action approach) |
| Appraiser of Needs: | Educational institution or experts | Parents, institutions and experts mutually assess needs | Parent groups, civil rights groups, local community |
| Motivating Rationale: | Deficits in impact target and/or superior knowledge of educational experts | Participatory democracy, humanitarian value system civil rights movements, social movement for parent involvement in education and school, responsiveness and accountability. Mutual lack of fit between culture of local communities and education establishment | Failure of educational institution or larger society |
| Immediate Goal: | Parent education: change in parent attitudes & concomitant change in behavior; or utilization of parent services, smoother functioning of institution | Mutual change, mutual give-and-take | Change in educational institutions or society |
| Ultimate Outcome: | More positive impact of parent on child, academic success of child, better fit of child into formal educational process; or smoother functioning of institution | Mutual change for benefit of children | Increased social competence of all children including their academic success, by changes within the broad social environment |
| Special Influences: | | Local factors such as racial characteristics, attitudes of cooperation/antagonism, and size of both school & community; legislative or administrative mandates affecting availability of jobs & positions for parents & other opportunities for involvement; school openness & responsiveness reflected by knowledge about, training in, and commitment to school-community relations by teachers & administrators | |
| Examples: | Many parent education efforts, parent newsletters; parent-teacher conferences, PTA, home visits | Parents as employees, staff, policy makers, advisors, planners; growth of parent involvement in Head Start, Follow Through & Bilingual Programs | Community control & decentralization movement of early 70's |

mary focus of FACS is on the family in the context of the community, it was felt that a focus on programs which are located in a range of community institutions was more adequate to the purposes of the project. Since the focus of the review was on parent education programs, parent involvement programs would be included only if they contained a significant parent education component. The criteria for selecting documents for review, then, was restricted to those dealing with programs in which parents were the target of some educational intervention aimed at changing some aspect of their performance as parents. It was decided to include in the review any report about parent education programs irrespective of the type of agency sponsoring the program.

## II. PARENT EDUCATION AND PARENT EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN THE LITERATURE

A. Scope of the Literature Review and Review Procedures: The revised FACS literature review was designed to provide the background information necessary to define and plan future research efforts. The original scope of effort for FACS was to have encompassed the social science literature dealing with the family and community. On the basis of negotiations with NIE staff and consultants, the scope of the review was narrowed to Parent Education programs as representative of selected aspects of the relationships between family and community. These programs were selected because they encompass a range of community institutions which have explicit links between their stated purposes as support systems and the family's function of child rearing.

The review was designed to meet the following general objectives:

1. To clarify the relationship between Parent Education and Parent Involvement in Education
2. To summarize the results of recent parent education research
3. To determine the range and variety of parent education programs reported in the literature
4. To determine the quality and quantity of information available in the reports about parent education programs.

The FACS literature review consisted of four steps designed to provide systematic coverage of available materials and to help generate information needed for the next phase of study. The steps were as follows: 1) Identification, 2) Document Classification, 3) Preliminary Review, and 4) Data Reduction. These steps will be briefly described here.

1. Identification. The primary sources of information utilized by FACS were the ERIC and CIJE bases. Searches were submitted to ERIC to generate

materials on the following topics:

a. Parent-School Relationships
b. Parent Education Models
c. Community Involvement
d. Parent Education Programs
e. Parent Education Theories
f. Parent Education Reviews
g. Community Services

These general topic areas were cross-tabulated to produce five different searches of the ERIC data base; a total of approximately 800 materials were generated by the searches.

In addition to ERIC and CIJE, the University of Texas Main Library and the PMIC Library housed at SEDL were used to locate materials. Bibliographies from recent reviews of parent education programs were also examined. The ERIC/CIJE searches were found to be very comprehensive, and library searches uncovered very few materials not listed in the ERIC printouts.

2. Document Classification. Given the large number of references generated by the identification strategies, it was necessary to design a system to sort, classify, select and eliminate materials. To accomplish this task, a set of coding guidelines was developed (see Appendix A). The development of the coding categories was based on a combination of (1) ideas from several of the major conceptual overviews such as Stanford Institute (1973), Goodson and Hess (1976, Hess et al (1971), Dobson and Dobson (1975), and (2) the needs of the FACS project. The conceptual overviews were used primarily to create a preliminary typology of the different types of parent programs for use in the coding guidelines. The conceptual overviews used various classification schemas to describe parent education programs, and they were not always in agreement. For example, programs were classified in terms of underlying

assumptions, parent roles, location of program, etc. After considering a number of different alternatives, it was determined that categorizing programs by parental role vis-à-vis the educational institution would be the most efficient system since a quick perusal of each document would be sufficient to obtain the information required. The following parental roles were selected for inclusion on the coding sheet:

a. Parents as Learners. This role involved program activities which were primarily directed toward teaching the parents some skill, new behavior, etc.

b. Parents as Workers in the School. Parents participated in school activities in one of a number of roles, such as volunteers, paraprofessionals, etc.

c. Parents as Consultants. Parents were utilized as resources, parent opinion was solicited, etc.

d. Parents as Decision-Makers. Activities which involved parents in policy making, participation by parents in activities which assured them of some measure of control.

e. Parent Inclusion. A generally defined category intended for materials which deal with parent involvement in school-related activities, but which are either not covered by 3 or 4 above or insufficiently described in the reports.

In addition to classifying materials according to the aforementioned roles, the coding sheets also were used to classify materials according to the purpose of the document, such as Description of Single Programs, Review of Programs, etc.

Because one original purpose of the FACS Project was to examine different community institutions, two different coding sheets were prepared.

One code sheet was intended for use with materials describing programs which were based in educational institutions. The non-school based code sheet utilized the same categories with the exception that parental role #2, Parents as Workers in the School, was altered to reflect work in the community (see Appendix A).

The code sheets were used with the 800 materials generated by the FACS identification activities. This resulted in clusterings of materials by parental role and type of document. For example, there were clusters of materials which described non-school based programs which taught parents parenting skills or clusters of research studies concerned with school-based programs teaching parents to tutor their children.

3. Preliminary Review. The completed code sheets were examined to determine which clusters of materials might be more important to the FACS Project. Since a focus of the project was primarily on programs which use educational techniques to teach parents rather than on programs which were designed to involve parents in governance, the materials clustered under the Parents As Learners categories were selected for attention. Annotated cards were prepared for all materials in both the School and Non-School based code sheets which were concerned with Parents As Learners. Each card was coded according to both document type (e.g., Description, Research, etc.) and program content and sorted according to the coding classification.

This preliminary sorting and review of materials clearly highlighted an important distinction in the types of information contained in the literature. Those materials which clustered in the Research Study, Review of Programs, Conceptual Materials, or Literature Review cells on the code sheets (referred to hereafter as Research Oriented Documents (RODs))

differed significantly from those materials clustered in the Description or Evaluation of Single Program cells (referred to hereafter as Descriptive Reports (DRs)).

The RODs were evaluative in nature and designed to answer research questions having to do with the effectiveness and replicability of the programs. The DRs were descriptive in nature and designed to present information about the operation of a program and the services delivered by the program.

The RODs focused almost exclusively on nationally recognized programs which were primarily carried out in educational institutions. The vast majority of programs examined in the RODs were designed to teach parents to tutor their own children and were intended to affect the child's cognitive functioning. The DRs discussed smaller scale, service oriented programs designed to impact a wider range of parental roles, to affect parents and children in a variety of ways, and which were sponsored by a number of different agencies.

The Research Oriented Documents and the Descriptive Reports contributed different kinds of information to the FACS Project. The RODs contributed examples of different conceptual approaches to parent education programs and documented research efforts to determine program effectiveness. The research and conceptual approaches also contributed insights used to develop a method to analyze the DRs. The Descriptive Reports illustrated the range of Parent Education programs and the extent to which available reports provide sufficient information to determine what was the nature of the program and the social context in which it operated.

4. Data Reduction. A total of 87 programs were identified as the

Descriptive Reports. In order to analyze these 87 programs, FACS developed a standardized Program Data Sheet (PDS) (See Appendix A) based on the approaches described in the RODs and the needs of the FACS Project. The PDS was designed to extract information from each of the reports which could serve as the basis for comparing information across programs in a systematic way.

The PDS contained a total of 8 dimensions:

1. Program identification information
2. Target population and participant characteristics
3. Program staff characteristics
4. Program content and delivery modes
5. Program evaluation/results
6. Rationale/Motivation for programs
7. Sociocultural Context
8. Needs perceived by leaders/promoters

A PDS was filled out for each of the 87 reports. As was expected, the amount and detail in the Descriptive Reports was highly variable; some had complete information on some topics, but incomplete information on others; some reports were inadequate in almost all dimensions. It should be noted that the amount and quality of information on dimensions 6, 7, and 8 above was inadequate for most reports. These dimensions, therefore, receive no attention in the analysis presented below.

To summarize, the FACS literature review consisted of four major steps: Identification, Document Classification, Preliminary Review, and Data Reduction. These procedures identified two distinct types of documents which contained different kinds of information. The analysis of these two types of documents are reported in the next five sections,

which include discussions of 1) Parental Roles, 2) the distinction between parent education and parent involvement, 3) evidence for the effectiveness of parent education, 4) the range of different types of parent education programs, and 5) conclusions and recommendations derived from the literature.

B. Parent Roles: Parent Education Programs are a form of social support to help parents better perform their role of bringing up children. The determination that with increased knowledge parents might be able to perform their role better can be made by the parents themselves. In other cases, professionals determine that parents need help after observing the parents or after examining the children whom failure might be ascribed to what their parents did or did not do.

The relative helplessness of the human infant is a basic characteristic of the human condition; the human infant after birth will be dependent on others for survival for a long time. The mother-father-child nuclear family is the social unit into which most contemporary American infants are born and the societal expectation is that the parents will be responsible for bringing up the child. The initial helplessness of infants gives rise to their need for nurturance, while their increased mobility and autonomy later will require some measure of control by parents and other caretakers.

The allocation to the father and mother of specific tasks and responsibility for child rearing constitutes the basis for the definition of parental roles. Sex differences account for some specialization (i.e. the mother breastfeeds), while most other differences are determined by the social practices of the group.

Winch (1971) has noted that the characteristics of child rearing

practices( the content of parental roles) in any society are determined by (1) the conception of the nature and potentialities ascribed to the human infant, (2) the characteristics of the adult ideal into which the child must evolve, and (3) the beliefs held about the procedures that will help the child become such an adult. Changes in the socially dominant beliefs related to each of these three elements will substantially alter the nature of the child rearing practices.

Child rearing practices are socially determined in part by the learning opportunities and types of models available to parents. The family of origin provides one such model; other family units in the neighborhood and accessible relatives in extended, multigenerational families may also serve as models. Industrialization and urbanization results in more and more prospective parents who are deprived of these real-life models. Residential patterns and the size of the housing units accompany a decrease in the size of the household family unit, thus depriving young people of close experiences with practicing parents as models and the advice of older, more experienced relatives.

These real life models have given way in today's society to models presented in the mass media. Advice comes more in the form of magazines and books rather than from direct personal contact. Formal educational programs have been designed to provide young people with information and skills to prepare them for parenthood. The Family Life Education tradition, which includes marriage preparation as well as education for parenthood, is one such program. In addition, parents have been the target of formal parent education programs in America since the last part of the nineteenth century. The content of such parent education programs and in general the advice given to parents has been

diverse and often contradictory. Some trends in advice to parents have been documented by examining the content of specific publications, such as popular magazines and books (Sunley, 1955; Stendler, 1950; Wolfestein, 1953).

The content of advice and education for parents responds to the beliefs held by dominant segments of the society. A major source of advice to parents has been the religious teachings representing the dominant Christian tradition of American society. The post World War I period has seen the rise to prominence of behavioral scientists as the major shapers of child rearing advice. Although their advice has often been contradictory, there are clear trends that have become dominant at certain times. As we shall see, the current interest in the role of the parent as the child's first teacher has been greatly influenced by child development research. Practical application of this research is apparent in the compensatory education movement.

C. From Parent Education to Parent Involvement and Back Again: The compensatory education efforts of the 1960's were based on research which suggested that parental influence was extremely important in the early years of a child's cognitive development. These findings, together with the social philosophy of the War on Poverty, which stressed the need for community involvement, renewed interest in parents as the focus of intervention. Numerous Early Childhood Education programs were implemented which varied in the type, focus and intensity of intervention. Some programs were directed to the child but used the parents as resources, volunteers and sometimes as staff members. Some programs were directed to the parent as a means to provide early education to the children, and some involved parents as decision-makers. As these programs become more prevalent and various combinations and alternatives

were tried out, they became the subject of research studies which attempted to provide an assessment of their effectiveness. This literature constitutes the primary background for some current confusion in parent education.

An examination of the current research literature on parent education reveals a peculiar state of affairs. The attempt to define "parent education" both as a concept and as a social fact presents a difficult problem. The term occurs with great frequency in the current literature, often unaccompanied by a concise definition, indeed, often without any definition at all. It is regularly used by an author interchangeably with other terms, which for other authors have distinctly different meanings. Further, programs are identified as "parent education programs" without explanation as to the parameters of the activities to be included under the label. The problem of identifying a program as a "parent education program" parallels the problem of definition of the terms: programs are often described using interchangeable labels; terms are used to describe the program with which others would disagree. This state of affairs clearly presents problems for workers in the field as well as for researchers attempting to study ongoing social processes.

Brim (1959), Gordon (1977), and Schlossman (1976) have made contributions to the historical background of parent education programs. Beginning in the 1880's, Stanley Hall popularized what might best be called an "evolutionary approach" to child development. Based on the then recently popular ideas of Darwin, he postulated the importance of hereditary bases of development, and argued for attention to the

child's "natural needs." The first distinctly identifiable "parent education" movement, the child-study movement (Schlossman, 1976:440), utilized these concepts. The child-study movement was primarily interested in the physical development of the child, and in designing ways to improve child health, but it also adopted Hall's concern with the "contents of childrens' minds."

Hall's ideas were incorporated into the next major phase of "parent education" activities, given life primarily by the inauguration of the PTA in 1897. Schlossman describes in some detail the conceptual basis for the trends evidenced by the PTA. Of interest to FACS activities is the two general thrusts of the PTA. First, increased attention was paid to improving the quality of life in the home. This was best done by following the precepts of Deweyian psychology, which PTA members were encouraged to learn and apply at home. Second, this movement endorsed and promoted political activity on behalf of the poor. During this era, the PTA was explicitly aimed toward "bettering the life of the poor." In essence, middle class women were perceived as change agents, while lower class women were the recipients of the new social theories intended to improve the lives of children. Of interest to us is these two trends: upgrading of the quality of life in the home, and concern with the larger community in the form of social action and reform.

The emphasis in the 1920's shifted considerably from this earlier period. The theoretical base of the 20's revolved around the developing behaviorist psychology of Watson. The major emphasis was on teaching middle class women the tenets of the (now) new psychology so that they could be in a position to raise their children according to its precepts. The interest in social reform all but died out; the previous

concern for "mainstreaming" immigrant and poor children was no longer a focus. During this period, interest rested almost exclusively on preschool children; parents were encouraged to participate in nursery school programs in order to become more "professional" parents (by applying the new psychology).

To summarize, first, the concept of parent education has been in existence for a number of years. Second, two general features have historically been associated with the term: 1) the desire to upgrade child care in the home by familiarizing parents which current notions of child development; and 2) social reforms which attempted to change the life experiences of poor or immigrant parents and children.

These two general features, evident from 1880 through the 1920's, are of course the same features which mushroom again in the 1960's. As was to be expected, the form that these two trends took in the 60's was based on different social and psychological arguments. Hess et a. (1969), Bronfenbrenner (1974), and others document at some length the research which underlies this period. Briefly, 1) the cognitive development of the child was considered to be the most crucial to the child's future success; 2) a "critical period" for a developing child was postulated to be from birth to three or four years; 3) the parents, particularly the mother, were identified as the most important influence during that period, and 4) poor and minority parents were ill equipped to raise their children properly during this critical period, as in part demonstrated by the failure of poor children in school. Another influence during this period was the War on Poverty, which ...d as one of its strategies the local control of poverty programs. The response to this set of findings was the proliferation of programs designed to

aid poor children, particularly in terms of their cognitive development.

Given the social climate and this complex of research findings which locate the critical period in early childhood, the critical developmental feature in cognition, the crucial influence in the mother, and the outcome in school failure, compensatory education programs arose in response. As is well known, the early childhood compensatory education programs were designed to have impact on the child, particularly on the child's cognitive development; they were direct intervention efforts focused on poor children. The influence of the War on Poverty strategies, combined with research arguing for the significant influence of the mother, served as the rationalization for including parents in the programs. It is as a result of the development of compensatory education programs and parents' involvement in them that the use of the concept of parent education has become confusing.

Let us examine this assertion. The rebirth of interest in "parent education" and related terms such as "parent participation," "parent involvement," and the consequent proliferation of programs, historically coincides with the onset of compensatory education programs. As a result, our current understanding of what constitutes programs which deal with parents ( including parent education) is heavily influenced by <u>its association with these educational institutions</u>. As has been shown, the historical concept of "parent education" focused on upgrading child care and social reform directed to poor parents; it was not limited to educational establishments. In the 60's this concept was replaced by another term, "parent involvement," which included all activities (including school-based parent education) <u>relating parents to the educational system</u>. The literature describing these relationships

between parent and school is the basis for our current understanding (and confusion) as to what constitutes parent involvement, parent education, and parent participation. As will be pointed out, this new term, "parent involvement," was both broader than the term "parent education" with reference to the range of activities included; but was also narrower, in that it restricted the definition to activities based in educational institutions.

Parent Involvement as a term in the literature is used almost exclusively in reference to compensatory education programs, and is usually defined by listing the types of activities it includes:

> . . . parent involvement in compensatory education programs is not a simple unitary concept. Parents have been encouraged to participate in many different capacities, which can be classified into three main types of activities: Parents as tutors of their own children, parents as employees of the school, and parents as decision makers or advisors to school personnel. (Stanford Research Institute 1973, p. iii.)

The range of activities that make up parent involvement reflects the concern of the times because it describes activities which exhibit differing degrees of parental control over school operations (what Pink, 1977, terms "governance"). Gordon's schema (1970) was the prototype for most subsequent descriptions (including the above quote from the Stanford Institute). He identifies five roles which cover the range of parent involvement 1) parents as audience-bystander-observer, 2) parents as teachers of their own children, 3) parents as volunteers, 4) parents as trained workers, and 5) parents as decision-makers. This schema permits a ranking of activities ranging from least control (1) to greatest control (5) over the school.

Since the late 60's and early 70's, most approaches have attempted to fit parent education into a schema of the sort described above. The

result has been confusion, which the following quote taken from Lois-ellen Datta's (1973) report clearly demonstrates:

> Types of parent involvement in Early Childhood Education: This summary of conclusions has mentioned only one type of *parent involvement* in ECE: parents as recipients of training in child rearing. There are many forms which such *education for parenthood* has taken, and these will be discussed in section 5.0. *Parent education* is, however, only one variety of parent involvement in ECE. Others considered are (ii) parents as paid staff members, (iii) parents as decision-makers in ECE programs, and (iv) parents as resources in the educational process from whom teachers can learn . . .
>
> Parent Roles in ECE
>
> (i) '*Parents as tutors of their own children*: In this kind of participation, parents, generally mothers, are given skills to aid in the development of their own children . .' (Inset quote from Stearns and Peterson, pp. 3-6, 1973.)
> (Datta, p. 5-6, 1973. Italics added.)

A brief examination of the italicized phrases will provide us with an example of the kinds of confusions which are occuring in the use of terms. Datta uses "parent involvement" as a cover term for four activities; its usage here parallels the use of "parent participation" as used by Chilman (1968; 1973), Lazar and Chapman (1972), and Goodson and Hess (1976). "Parent education" as Datta uses it in line four appears to refer to "training in child rearing"; it is identified as one type (i) of parent involvement activity. However, (i) in the second paragraph is labeled as "parents as tutors of their own children". It seems that in Datta's schema, "parent education" = parents as tutors. The argument here is that parent education, while it may include teaching tutoring skills, is not limited to it, nor is it exclusively found in relation to school programs.

The parent education label should be used only to refer to those activities that utilize education techniques to effect changes in the

parent role performance, regardless of setting. The key phrase in this definition is parent role. Parent Education focuses on the individual in his or her capacity as a parent. As Brim (1959) points out, this differs from focusing on the individual as husband, sister, brother, as in the case in Family Life Courses, or on the individual as citizen (Pink, 1977) as is the case with some parent involvement activities.

To summarize, it is proposed that for purposes of clarity parent education be defined as those activities concerned with the development of effective parenting skills, attitudes, and behaviors which help optimize the development and education of children, thus enabling parents and those who fill a parenting function to become more effective. In other words, parent education involves those activities which use educational techniques to effect changes in the parent role performance of individuals. Parent education activities are based on the assumption that the behavior of parents can be changed, and that certain educational techniques are an efficient way to accomplish these changes.

D. The Evidence for Effectiveness of Parent Education: The previous discussion has demonstrated that one source of confusion in the literature is that parent education activities take place in both educational and non-educational institutional settings, and that in educational settings, parent education activities are often only part of a larger parent involvement program. In these educationally-based parent involvement programs, parents have participated in a range of roles from teacher to policy maker. This has made it difficult for researchers to isolate the effects either of a single role or a single program component. Despite the difficulties, however, some researchers have tried to assess the effects of parent education as distinct from the effects

of the wider parent involvement program.

The literature which attempts to assess the effectiveness of parent education programs in educational settings has concentrated almost exclusively on the Parent as Teacher role. Part of the reason the parent as teacher has received so much attention is that programs utilizing this focus tend to be more rigorously designed in terms of content and activities, tend to have specific, measurable, school-related outcomes (e.g., cognitive gain), and tend to have evaluation data available. Since research on the effectiveness of the parent as teacher constitutes virtually the only documentation of the effects of parent education generally, this research will be discussed at length.

Evalutions in the research reviews of the effects of parent education based in non-educational settings is almost non-existant. There is no clear indication of the effectiveness of parent education focused on roles other than that of parent as teacher. The next several sections of the report will discuss the evidence for the effectiveness of the various forms of parent education in both educational and non-educational settings. First, it will discuss the various roles parents may take in the larger, educationally based parent involvement programs. Second, it will discuss research efforts to document the effects of a single role, parent as teacher. This discussion will also include brief mention of other educationally-related roles. Third the report will describe the limited evidence available on the effects of non-educationally based parent education.

1. Parent Roles in Educationally-Based Programs. Gordon (1970) identified five general roles or levels which he suggested cover the range of parent involvement: (1) parents as audience-bystander-observer, (2) parents as

teachers of their own children, (3) parents as volunteers, (4) parents as trained workers, and (5) parents in decision-making roles. Different studies have focused on one or more of these categories in varying degrees of detail. Gordon's schema can be used to discuss parental involvement in terms of relative degree of parental decision-making power. A number of studies however, have adopted his schema (or portions of it) as descriptions of the role of parents in various programs without reference to governance. Table 1 lists the foci of a few major studies in terms of parental roles.

The lowest level of involvement is enacted by parents who serve as resources, supporters or facilitators of activities taking place in the program. The next level in this continuum is occupied by parents as learners, where the content of the learning experience is not directly related to specific activities of the programs. Parents as teachers of their own children constitutes the next level of involvement, and this teaching often takes place at home. The next step is the involvement of parents as volunteers and/or teacher aides in the classroom. This role is part of a career ladder that could help some parents escape from unemployment and give them marketable skills. The highest level of involvement is the participation of parents as policy-makers, such as the mandated roles written into guidelines for Head Start and Follow Through.

2. Evidence for Effectiveness of Educationally-Based Parent Education Programs. Some programs received considerable attention from the research community, because they were primarily designed and funded to answer questions about effectiveness and about implementation on a larger scale. Assessments of effectiveness and implementation in these

TABLE 1
PARENTAL ROLES IN RECENT REVIEWS OF RESEARCH

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gordon (1970) | | audience, by-stander ob-server | parents teach own children | volunteers | trained staff | | decision-maker |
| Hess, et al (1971) | parents as resources | parents as learners | parents teach own children | volunteers | teacher-aides | | policy-maker, decision-maker |
| Datta (1973) | parents as resources | | parents as tutors | | paid staff | advisors | decision-makers |
| Lazar and Chapman (1973) | | parents as receivers of information | parents as teachers of own children | volunteers | staff | | decision-maker |
| Stanford Institute Report (1973) | | | parents as tutors | Aides | | | decision-maker |
| Goodson & Hess (1976) | parents as resources | | parents as teachers of own children | | | | policy-making |
| Bronfenbrenner (1974) | | parents as receivers of information | parents as tutors | | | | |

well-studied programs are found primarily in evaluations carried out either by program staff or by outside researchers. These programs often have opportunities for parents to engage in activities and roles other than as recipients of educational training. These roles include parents as supporters of school programs, as paid staff or classroom volunteers, as decision makers and/or resources from whom the teacher can learn. Consequently, many of the reviews evaluate the effects of parent involvement, of which parent education is only one form. Other problems which cause confusion and prevent clear evaluation comparisons are the variability among programs on such factors as size, evaluation design, parent education activity and content, duration of program, age of children, etc.

Hess, et al (1971) found some evidence of positive effects on children in programs that trained the parent to function as a teacher (parent-as-teacher role). Schaefer (1972) reviewed a smaller number of programs that taught parents skills in educating their own children, and which represented the best known intervention studies ongoing at that time. He concluded that such programs were effective supplements or alternatives for preschool education (p. 238).

Chilman (1973) approached the analysis of parent programs from the perspective of their impact on poverty. Since most programs in the sixties were directed to low income groups, they were somehow expected to affect the poverty cycle. She found a trend in the sixties moving (from parents as teacher programs to those) in which parents participate as employees, policy makers and advisors, and as members of social action groups. Chilman (1973) reviewed sixteen programs and she concluded that these efforts were not very successful in breaking the

poverty cycle. She speculated that the indications of positive results of programs using low income parents as tutors would become clearer in later studies. It is not surprising to find that educational efforts directed to low income groups do not, in and of themselves, significantly affect the lives of the poor. The level and intensity of effort involved in most programs, and number of people reached, precludes achieving such an optimistic goal.

A large scale evaluative review of programs encompassing various forms of parent involvement and various approaches to parent education, sponsored by the Office of Child Development, was done by Lazar and Chapman (1972). In these programs focused on training parents (mothers) as teachers, the authors found positive immediate effects on the IQ, achievement and language development of the children. The degree of success of these programs apparently was related to the importance given to the parent-as-teacher role in the program.

Drawing on the resources of the Interagency Panel on Early Childhood Research and Development, Lazar and Chapman identified reports originating from the various federal agencies represented on the Panel. Studies dealing with parent education or with a parent involvement component were reviewed. For the purposes of their review, they classified the projects into three groups in terms of the primary focus of programatic activity: (1) Parent-oriented programs, (2) Child-oriented programs with a parent component and (3) Omnibus programs, focused on both parents and children and with components such as health and social services in addition to education. Examples of Omnibus programs are Head Start, Follow Through and Parent-Child Development Centers.

The Parent-oriented programs are divided into the following

categories: (1) Home teaching, (2) Use of mass media for parent education, (3) Training parents through group discussion techniques, (4) Parent education in pediatric and health facilities, (5) Training adolescents for parenthood, and (6) Parents as staff. The rationale behind this classification seems to be pure convenience, since the various groups of programs represent a mixture of roles, methods, settings, and special target groups. Likewise, the categorization of Child-oriented programs includes: (1) Training parents in cognitive intervention techniques, (2) Training parents in behavior modification techniques, (3) Programs to increase parent-school cooperation and communication and (4) Parent involvement in decision-making positions in programs affecting their children.

Lazar and Chapman found that virtually all programs were targeted to low income parents and children, and that in most cases parent education meant mother education. Virtually all the studies focused on training mothers as the primary agents of intervention have reported positive immediate effects on the IQ, achievement or language development of the children. Similar but not so frequent results have been found in parent education components of child-oriented programs. Thus, there seems to be a trend toward success related to the intensity and centrality of the parent's role.

Lazar and Chapman found that early childhood education programs have become more effective in involving low income mothers in a variety of roles, and this is related to promoting understanding among staff about how to increase parent attendance. However, some programs using less intensive parent participation components have found gains in cognitive functioning and achievement of children. One weakness associated with the

research reviewed is inherent to the patterns of funding of the agencies involved; many studies have been short-term ones, some lasting only eight to ten weeks.

The relative permanence of gains in cognitive functioning was explored by other researchers. Bronfenbrenner (1974) undertook an in-depth study of compensatory education programs, and examined many facets of early intervention, including parent involvement. In his study of parent involvement (also described by the author as "parent intervention") the programs examined were not strict "parent education" programs but were programs which included other intervention strategies as well. Some of Bronfenbrenner's conclusions were as follows:

1. That substantial gains in IQ result from parent-child intervention. These gains are evident 3-4 years later.
2. That IQ gains are more pronounced the younger the children. Intervention has little effect after age 5.
3. That younger siblings and the parent also benefit.
4. That preschool IQ gains are reduced to the extent that the parent involvement is reduced.
5. That parent intervention in the early years apparently achieves its immediate and long-term effectiveness by focusing on both parent and child; e.g., the involvement of the parent and child in verbal interaction around a challenging cognitive task.

Goodson and Hess (1975, 1976) studied the long-term effects of programs supported by federal funds in the late sixties and early seventies. Twenty-eight parent education programs which were designed to educate low income parents to teach preschool children school-related cognitive and social skills were selected for examination. The instructional methods and specific contents varied across the 28 programs selected. One criterion for selection was the availability

of evaluation data and an adequate description of the programs.

The authors identified assumptions shared by most of the developers of the programs reviewed. The first assumption posits a home deficit prevalent in low income groups that fails to prepare the young child for successful entry into school. The second assumption holds that the early years are particularly important in setting the pace and direction of cognitive growth. The third assumption is that the impact of the family is not usually overcome by later schooling. These three assumptions combined dictate the tone of the programs, directed to low income parents of young preschool children with a heavy cognitive emphasis geared to prepare them for later entry into the school system.

The programs selected by Goodson and Hess not surprisingly contain the major programs supported by federal funds in the last part of the sixties and early seventies. They were programs identified with a main name or institution, contained a significant amount of effort and resources designated for evaluation and testing, lasted for several years, included various cohorts, and the children were followed into the early years of school in order to collect evidence for long term effects. In spite of the strong and explicit research goals of the programs, in many cases research considerations had to be changed for ethical or practical considerations involved in working with real life people. These constraints, added to limitations imposed by field conditions, should serve to place the findings in their proper context.

In general, the authors found the programs to be successful, as demonstrated by initial IQ gains which were maintained by children in about half the programs over the time spanned by the follow-up, and by improved school performance.

Goodson and Hess state:

> these intervention programs were successful in providing children with both immediate and long term advantages in skills that are relevant to school performance. These are represented in initial gains in IQ scores, which, although they decline a bit, still show gains maintained over the length of time spanned by these evaluations. The results from achievement tests, grades, and grade placement were highly consistent in displaying evidence of gains from the programs. Although not of a central concern, teacher ratings of children's social adjustment also consistently distinguished between program and control children.
> (Goodson and Hess, 1976, p. 25.)

In addition to cognitive gains, Goodson and Hess attempted to determine the relative importance of five variables of program format and content. These variables are: (1) importance or salience of the parent training component with respect to the total program. The programs range from home visits only (maximum emphasis) to parent classes in groups in addition to classes for children. (2) The curricular content of the program, classified into (a) emphasis in verbal development (b) sensory-motor development and (c) general cognitive development. (3) The teacher-parent ratio, defined as one-to-one vs. one-to-group. (4) Structure in the parent-teacher activity, where (a) high structure was defined as programs that develop a sequence of predetermined concrete tasks for parents; (b) medium structure was defined by exclusion (not high structured). (5) Specificity of instruction where (a) high specificity was defined as training in the use of specific teaching techniques; (b) moderate specificity was judged by exclusion.

These features were found to be only modestly related to the magnitude of program effectiveness. It appears that the more a program is focused on the parents, the more likely it is to produce significant and stable IQ gains for children. No single curriculum of parent teaching

activities was favored by the outcome criteria, although high structure (predetermined concrete tasks) was associated with higher program effectiveness. A one-to-one parent-teacher ratio was related to greater effects in both immediate and follow-up testing.

Some effects on the parents themselves, observed in about half of the programs, involve attitudes, parent-child interactions and home environment. Among the attitudes affected, the ones most often reported were a sense of personal efficacy or control over one's life, attitudes towards one's own child, and developmental expectations. Both verbal and non-verbal behavior were found to be affected in parent-child interactions using a variety of measures. Finally, there is some evidence that the intervention changed the home environment, in terms of overall level of stimulation in the home and effects on siblings.

Goodson and Hess state:

> The programs summarized here consistently provided significant immediate gains in children's IQ scores, which seemed to be maintained in about half of the programs that carried out follow-up testing. They also appeared to affect school performance in a positive direction and to influence the language, attitudes and teaching behavior of parents. The success of these parent training programs suggests that parent participation of this type is an important component of early intervention programs. (Goodson and Hess, 1976, p. 49.)

In summary, Goodson and Hess found the programs to be successful based on (1) initial IQ gains which were maintained by approximately half the programs and (2) by improved school performance. The authors also concluded that the more the programs focused on parents, the more one-to-one parent-teacher contact there was, and that the more structure given, the more likely programs were to show stable and significant improvement in IQ. Some positive effects on the parents themselves were

also found in some cases, along with some evidence that the intervention improved the home environment.

In a recent address to a group of education professionals, Gordon (1978) discussed research results on the effects of parent involvement on schooling. He states that:

> . . . there is considerable evidence from a number of programs, (that) the evidence is fairly consistent across these programs, and that the evidence is positive, that there are indeed long-term effects of parent involvement programs...The latest data... indicate that children from families who participated in the pre-school years in parent impact (analogous to parent education) model programs, are still doing better in school than comparison or control children, as long as ten years after programs end. (pp. 10-11.)

His conclusions, based on the latest data reported by Dr. Irving Lazar et al (February, 1977), the Goodson and Hess (1976) reviews, and some less methodologically sound programs, are as follows:

> That parent impact model programs are generally successful when they are carefully planned, are structured, when they have an educational focus, and when it includes parents and children working together at home as a major delivery system.
>
> That programs need to be conducted over time and results take time to become apparent; programs of short duration will not have any worthwhile impact.

Gordon (1978) also discusses programs which attempt not only to improve children's academic achievement (through parent education vis-à-vis his "parent impact" model) but also to improve the relationship between home and school. These programs attempt to involve parents at all levels; i.e., in all aspects in which they might participate such as volunteers, classroom participants, decision-makers, etc. Gordon calls this model the "community impact" model, the ultimate "systems" view, and represents it as a wheel with the various parent involvement

roles as the spokes. In order to create a mutually responsive relationship between home and school, as represented by the turning wheel, all the spokes must be present. The implication of this model is that a turning wheel (or better home-school relationship) will enhance the positive effects of parent education activities beyond those which might be expected if carried out independently.

3. Evidence for Effectiveness in Non-Educationally Based Parent Education Programs. The educationally based parent education programs carried out in the context of compensatory programs for low income parents provide one set of data regarding the effectiveness of parent education efforts. These can be characterized as directed to improve the performance of the parent as preschool teacher or as a tutor of their children. A complementary view of parent education focused on other important aspects of the parent role is found in a recent review by Croake and Glover (1977). They define parent education as "the purposive learning activity of parents who are attempting to change their methods of interacting with their children for the purpose of encouraging positive behavior in their children" (1977:151).

After a brief historical introduction to parent education that makes no reference to the compensatory education movement of the 60's, Croake and Glover state that:

> Parent education efforts have continued to expand from the late 1940's to the present, with both public and private participation from national to local levels. A variety of professionals and non-professionals teach in parent education programs under the auspices of mental health, schools, and other associations using nearly every imaginable form of media. Croake and Glover, 1977, p. 152.

Croake and Glover restrict their coverage to programs dealing with topics related to helping parents understand their children and themselves

in relation to children. These include child development, norms, general personality and functioning, child rearing techniques and situations, methods of discipline, emotions and their expression, interpersonal communications, etc. The methods used to convey these contents include mass media, group discussions and individual counseling. Today, however, they feel parent education and group methods in parent education are practically synonymous.

The references consulted in this review are few and for the most part very old. From their professional perspectives as counselors and mental health workers, the authors see a trend emerging in the increasing popularity of behavior modification as an approach for parents to exercise more effective influence on the behavior of their children. In addition to behavior modification, they found a tendency to use specific curricula in parent disucssion groups advocating more democratic methods of child rearing. The major approaches described are the Adlerian orientation represented by Dreikers (Dreikers and Soltz, 1964) and the more Rogerian system of parent-child communication, such as Parent Effectiveness Training proposed by Gordon (1970).

These trends correspond to those described as being used by elementary school counselors by Lamb and Lamb (1975). Each one of these approaches in addition to the Rational-Emotive therapy model (Ellis, 1970), transactional analysis (Harris, 1967), reality therapy (Glasser, 1969), and the Haim Ginott approach (Ginott, 1965) have been used in group parent education.

Thus, from the perspective of general mental health, work with parents is giving way to work through parents, and the counseling practitioners have available to them some clear alternative approaches.

The little research reviewed comparing alternative approaches is inconclusive, and the major reasons are seen by Croake and Glover to be the limited scope of available research. Among the needs identified are a better description of programs (treatment), a greater range of client populations studied, more attention to fathers and whole families, greater attention to various family types, more attention to the age of parents trained, and attention to long term behavioral effects.

Croake and Glover conclude:

> What future parent education programs will be like is uncertain. Group discussions will probably be the dominant method regardless of the content. Parent education will not likely become a fully independent movement, but will probably receive increasing attention and emphasis within a variety of programs especially in the field of education and mental health. Croake and Glover, 1977, p. 157.

In summary, the various reviews considered in this section share a common concern, and that is one of increasing attention to the potential of parents as change agents. Whether called parent education, parent participation, or parent involvement, the programs and research reviewed recognized formally that what parents do or do not do is important and that they could profit from knowing and being able to choose from a wide array of alternative ways of going about their business.

E. <u>The Evidence for the Range and Variety of Parent Education Programs</u>:

In addition to the research-oriented documents (RODs) reviewed in the previous section, a number of programs with more modest aims have been found to exist in the literature in the form of descriptive reports (DRs). In an effort to document the characteristics of these programs, 87 DRs were located and subjected to close examination. These programs have been reported since 1970 and have not been included in the reviews of effectiveness discussed before. It was expected that an examination of

these reports would shed some light on trends and possible areas for research. Since the reports varied considerably in their comprehensiveness and organization, the basic information about each program was recorded on the standardized form, the PDS, described previously (Appendix A). In addition, each program identified has been numbered, described briefly, and listed in Appendix B. The numerals referred to in this section are listed in that Appendix.[1]

A close examination of these 87 programs revealed that they share some similarities, but also that they vary on a number of dimensions. One of the most obvious similarities is their relatively small scale. A program's scope and intensity is related to the budget and the resources allocated for its implementation. Programs may be as limited as a graduate student's simple, singular study (116). Atypical programs in this regard include a long term research effort funded by the Office of Child Development comparing alternative curriculum and delivery modes (69), state level programs, such as the California Early Education Program (80), and regional programs which cover several counties, such as one located in rural Appalachia (68). The majority, however, are neither sponsored for long-term by major funding sources, nor are they operating over wide geographic areas.

---

[1] In addition to the 87 programs described in this section of the report, the appendix contain 26 programs (1-26) which correspond to the well known research oriented programs reviewed in the previous section. Thirty additional programs (27-57) were designed for parents of handicapped children. These programs differ from those directed to parents of nonhandicapped children in terms of the basis of parental and child needs, and the objectives and methods employed to address those needs. Their fundamental differences seem to justify their exlusion from the body of this report. For an analysis of these programs, see Project FACS Phase I Progress Report, February, 1978.

In addition to being small scale, most of the reported programs are not characteristically research-oriented, but are focused more upon delivery of services. As a consequence, few programs have a rigorous research design and few reports describe procedures and other details with much depth, clarity, or consistency. The absence of information hinders the development of a vivid and truly accurate descriptive picture of these 87 programs and prevents a clear comparison of their differences and similarities.

1. Goals and Objectives for Parents. Falling within the domain of parent education, all of the programs examined were designed to influence (change) some aspect of the parent's role performance. Implicit in most of these programs is the assumption that some aspect of parental behavior is poorly enacted or could be better enacted and that intervention could help to improve this behavior. Such improved parent behavior was expected to enhance the child's development, improve the child's environment, or benefit the child in some other way. The specific behavior(s) target for change, however, tend to vary from program to program. In most cases, it is possible to single out the major targeted parent behavior or behaviors as the main objectives of program developers.

An examination of stated primary program objectives for parents indicated that programs could be clustered into three groupings. The clustering forms the basis of a preliminary typology of parent education programs. These categories represent an adequate preliminary typology for describing programs; all program reports include information about goals for parents, suggesting the salience of this feature to the program. Basing the classification on parental goals most accurately covers the range of programs for which data are available. These groupings

are as follows:

a. Parent Education for Teaching. The goal of these programs is to improve the role performance or skills of parents as teachers of their children. This change is assumed to benefit the child directly by improving his/her cognitive functioning and/or other school-related skills and achievement. Many of these programs are smaller scale approximations of model high intensity/high budget programs.

b. Parent Education for Parenting. The goal of these programs is to enhance the development or improve the role performance of the parent as a parent. This intervention is assumed to benefit the child by improving the parent-child relationship.

c. Parent Education for Self-Development. The goals of programs which are grouped into this category are to enhance the development of the parent as a person, or to improve the parent's competence to interact with his/her child's school or within the community. These changes are intended to indirectly benefit the child by improving the parents' functioning as a person or as a school participant or by improving the child's environment (school, classroom, community). Specific examples of content for these three main categories are found in Table 2.

2. Goals and Objectives for Children. Goals for children are often intertwined with or implicit within the program objectives for parents. When clearly stated in programs reports, a classification system similar to that for parents can be evolved (see Table 3). The main goals for children can be classified into the following groups:

a. Improvement in School-Related Behaviors

b. Enhancement of Abilities or Developmental Skill

TABLE 2
STATED GOALS FOR PARENTS IN SERVICE-ORIENTED PROGRAMS

| Stated Goal | Number of Programs* | Program Appendix ID Number |
|---|---|---|
| **PET: Parent Education for Teaching (own children)** | | |
| Teach general developmental skills | 18 | 59,65, 70, 71, 73, 85, 88, 91, 94, 103, 113, 122, 123, 124, 129, 142, 148, 155 |
| Teach general school-related skills | 26 | 58, 60, 61, 66, 67, 68, 72, 74, 76, 82, 88, 93, 111, 124, 125, 126, 128, 129, 131, 133, 134, 135, 137, 141, 144, 145 |
| Teach specific school-related skills | 7 | 62, 63, 64, 75, 77, 132, 138 |
| **PEP: Parent Education for Parenting** | | |
| Learn general parenting skills or improve parenting attitudes | 23 | 66, 78, 81, 86, 106, 108, 112, 114, 116, 119, 121, 122, 123, 127, 133, 134, 135, 143, 144, 146, 148, 149, 151, 153 |
| Improve communication with child | 4 | 115, 117, 118, 126 |
| Gain knowledge about child development | 6 | 119, 122, 123, 130, 139, 145 |
| **PESD: Parent Education for Self-Development** | | |
| a. Develop as a person<br>Enhance self-concept | 7 | 83, 91, 96, 116, 118, 120, 125 |
| Develop personal competencies | 10 | 92, 95, 103, 107, 110, 128, 136, 143, 148, 150 |
| b. Improve interaction between parents/school/community<br>Encourage involvement in general school affairs | 10 | 87, 90, 105, 119, 127, 129, 139, 140, 142, 147 |
| Develop as agents of education change | 5 | 79, 80, 119, 120, 121 |
| Train teachers to be more responsive to community | 1 | 109 |

*N=89

TABLE 3
STATED GOALS FOR CHILDREN IN SERVICE-ORIENTED PROGRAMS

| Stated Goal | Number of Programs* | Program Appendix ID Number |
|---|---|---|
| **Improvement in School-Related Behaviors** | | |
| Improve school attendance | 2 | 105, 109 |
| Improve homework skills | 1 | 111 |
| Ameliorate potential learning problems | 3 | 60, 74, 113 |
| Develop school-entry behavior/skills | 10 | 61, 68, 76, 112, 133, 135, 137, 142, 143, 146 |
| Improve academic performance or school social skills | 5 | 75, 80, 92, 109, 138 |
| **Enhancement of General Abilities or Development** | | |
| Improve developmental skills | 8 | 65, 67, 70, 71, 85, 88, 103, 155 |
| Improve self-concept | 4 | 58, 59, 91, 132 |
| Grow or learn in some unspecified way | 7 | 63, 81, 82, 95, 116, 149, 153 |
| **Miscellaneous** | | |
| Learn about role of parents | 1 | 137 |
| Learn about health-related or sex education topic | 4 | 107, 110, 115, 117 |
| Learn in same classroom with the handicapped | 1 | 79 |

*N=46

c. Other (miscellaneous) Goals

It should be emphasized that all of the 87 programs reviewed had explicitly stated goals for parents. That fact is not surprising because the programs are designed to have an effect on and change some aspect of parent role performance. However, the reasons behind the choice by a given program of a particular role or the type of parenting behavior to target for change are often unclear. Needs assessments of parents and/or children in relation to the parenting process are seldom undertaken.

Focus by a program on a particular parent behavior is primarily a function of the ultimate outcomes desired for the child. When the parent in the role of teacher is the focus of the program, the outcomes desired for the child are usually directly stated, or at least, clearly implied. The assumption is: if the parent learns to teach the child (better), the child should improve on some aspect of his learning and subsequent behavior. Goals for parents are usually clearly defined teaching tasks; concommitant goals for children are usually concrete and behavior-specific, whether directly stated in the programs reports or not. For example, if a parent is trained to teach his child to read, the child's reading skills are expected to improve. This parenting function--that of teacher--is often targeted for intervention because of a specific and concrete child problem. The unstated assumption is that either (1) the parent is at the root of the problem because of some poorly enacted teaching behaviors, or (2) that, although the parent is not at fault, improving some aspect of this behavior can help solve the problem. The aim of these types of programs is often remedial intervention.

On the other hand, when the focus of the program is on the more general role of parent, the benefits intended for the child are usually less concrete. For example, if a parent, as a result of intervention, has a more positive attitude toward his/her child, or increases his/her knowledge about child development, or improves his/her ability to communicate with his/her child, the child is expected to benefit in some (often unspecified) way. The child will "grow better," "develop more appropriately," "learn more," or have a "more positive self-concept." These kinds of programs may or may not have goals for childre presented as direct statement; when unstated, objectives may be less easily assumed, or, in any case, be more amorphous. The aim of these programs may be remedial, or programs may be intended for enrichment.

The third category is that of parent education for self-development. These programs are focused in a more concrete way on parents and in a very vague and indirect way on children. The parent intervention is for the "enhancement of parent self-concept," to "grow in personal competence," or to "develop as educational change agent." The child is expected to benefit from enhanced parental functioning by virtue of an improved environment, but specifically how he or she is to benefit is vague indeed.

Some programs have stated goals in addition to the outcomes desired for parents or children. Some developers of school-based programs, for example, have had objectives in mind for teachers, such as improvement of the parent-teacher relationship (92, 95, 109), or teacher-child relationship (80, 109), or the enhancement of teaching skills (80, 140, 142). Other programs were begun with the goal of developing a model for implementation elsewhere (65, 77, 82, 93, 96, 124, 135, 141, 149). Still others were developed to test a technique or

strategy: use of public library (64), videotaping (78), behavior recording (113), Adlerian approach (151), group consultation (155), democratic education approach (153), audiotaping (118), use of handbook (128), bibliography of instructional materials (32), develop management by objectives plan (140), develop curricular materials (141, 142) and use of parents as trainers of other parents (91, 111).

3. Eligibility, Recruitment, and Program Base. The specific characteristics of the target population (those eligible) and of the participants (those who actually take part) and the selection and recruitment procedures are not usually reported in detail. Since participation in all programs is voluntary, some element of self-selection is involved. Some programs conduct aggressive outreach activities (61, 64, 68, 70, 103, 120).

Most programs identified were directed to parents of preschool children including a few to parents of infants and toddlers (65, 69, 71, 73, 74, 78, 81, 86, 118, 124, 136). A small number addressed themselves to the parents of junior high and high school students (95, 105, 107, 110).

Most programs examined were designed for low income parents and children. In some cases, a more selective group of clients were singled out, e.g., parents of children with specific school problems were targeted in several cases (105, 108, 111, 138). Two programs selected parents of both handicapped and non-handicapped children (74, 79). Some programs have restrictions on eligibility of clients which are imposed by the funding source (58, 60, 61, 66).

Nearly all the programs reported are directed toward or, in effect, reach only mothers. One program reported participation by upper-middle

income mothers (96) and another by middle income Anglo women (116). A few attempted to reach fathers and other family members by scheduling activities in the evening (82, 92, 104, 105, 107).

Most of the programs reporting program base were located within some type of educational institution with the major one being the public schools (see Table 4). Other educational settings included a day care center, a preschool, a university research institute, and a vocational-technical center. Nine programs were based in non-educational institutions. These included a hospital prenatal clinic, a hospital, a Temple, a private nonprofit organization, a mental health center, a public library, and a neighborhood community center.

4. Delivery/Method of Instruction. The form of delivery which is used to carry out parent education functions varies considerably from program to program. In most cases, it is accomplished with a combination of several methods (such as individual conferences, classes and group discussion), but generally it is possible to single out the one or two primary means of instruction.

Individual contact in the home (home-visit) frequently supplemented by center-based activities, is a commonly utilized method of delivering parent education (N = 36; see Table 4). The ratio of staff person to parent client is 1 to 1; occasionally 2 to 1. The home visitor teaches the parent through 1) some direct training method, 2) informal discussion, and/or 3) modeling of the interaction with the child for the parent. The type and the diversity of content which tend to be descriptive examples of the conceptual range of objectives for parents and children are categorized in Tables 2 and 3. These include child management (68, 75, 111), child development (60, 68, 82, 88), teaching techniques

TABLE 4
PROGRAM LOCATION BASE OF SERVICE-ORIENTED PROGRAMS

| Location | Number of Programs* | Program Appendix ID Number |
|---|---|---|
| Educational Institution | | |
| Public School | 56 | 63, 67, 70, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 80, 82, 88, 90, 92, 94, 104, 105, 107, 108, 110, 112, 114, 115, 118-148, 151, 153, 155 |
| Day Care Centers | 3 | 58, 59, 150 |
| Preschool | 5 | 61, 72, 83, 91, 93 |
| University or Research Center | 10 | 65, 66, 68, 78, 79, 86, 95, 109, 113, 119 |
| Vocational-Technical Center | 1 | 60 |
| Non-educational Institution | | |
| Hospital Prenatal Clinic | 1 | 71 |
| Hospital | 2 | 81, 149 |
| Temple | 1 | |
| Private Organization | 1 | 103 |
| Mental Health Center | 2 | 85, 111 |
| Public Library | 2 | 64, 106 |
| Community Center | 1 | 62 |
| No Data | 2 | 87, 96 |

*N=87

(61, 66, 67, 88, 118, 119, 128, 129, 135), educational content (64, 68, 105), identification of child needs (70), use of materials (64, 74, 78, 107), etc. Home visits ranged in frequency from once per week to two per year, for durations ranging between 4 weeks to 10 months. The home visitor was usually identified as community coordinator, parent "graduate" of program, paraprofessional, project technician or program staff, teacher or teacher-aide, author of the report, or simply as "home visitor." (See Table 5.)

A few samples of home visit discussion topics are as follows: behavior modification techniques (111), Adlerian approach to child rearing (112), democratic child rearing (114, 153), nutrition (60), and others. In some cases, topics are chosen by the parent participants (64, 82, 116, 142).

Parent workshops were reportedly used for parent training purposes in twenty-seven programs (Table 6). Data presented was not sufficient to report a range for number of and duration of workshop sessions. The role of parent educator workshop leader was performed by teacher, trainer, agency staff, family learning specialist or director. Content areas included were behavioral problems, family dynamics, reading and health education.

Parent education was also reportedly occurring via parent participation in some fashion in the classroom or school (N = 18, Table 4). The types of school/classroom participation, purportedly educational in nature, vary widely. Some examples are: parent teaches own child (63, 72), teaches all children in classroom (82, 87, 90, 94, 130, 132), assists on field trips (74, 87), observes a role model interaction with child (71, 72), observes family being counseled (153), role-plays

TABLE 5
INSTRUCTOR FOR SERVICE-ORIENTED PROGRAMS

| Instructor | Number of Programs* | Program Appendix ID Number |
|---|---|---|
| **Home Visitors** | | |
| Teacher or Teacher Aide | 6 | 60, 64, 66, 67, 82, 118 |
| Project Technician or Program Staff | 2 | 70, 105 |
| Report Author | 2 | 65, 78 |
| Home Visitor | 10 | 61, 68, 88, 132, 133, 135, 136, 142, 144, 146 |
| Paraprofessional | 6 | 43, 119, 128, 129, 140, 143, 148 |
| Parent Program Graduates | 4 | 91, 109, 111, 125 |
| Community Coordinator | 1 | 74 |
| **Discussion Group Leaders** | | |
| Parents | 4 | 111, 112, 114, 155 |
| Family Counselor | 1 | 105 |
| Teacher | 3 | 60, 82, 140 |
| Staff | 3 | 64, 86, 139 |
| Author | 3 | 83, 85, 116 |
| Consultant | 1 | 134 |
| Community Leader | 1 | 117 |
| **Workshop Leaders** | | |
| Teacher | 16 | 61, 66, 90, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 131, 133, 135, 136, 137 |
| Trainer | 2 | 76, 109 |
| Staff | 7 | 90, 107, 108, 110, 120, 121, 125 |
| Learning Specialist | 4 | 63, 121, 126, 132 |
| Director | 5 | 59, 119, 124, 126, 130 |
| **Course or Lecture Series** | | |
| Teacher/Instructor | 7 | 58, 80, 92, 96, 103, 149, 150 |
| Professor and Translator | 1 | 62 |
| Counselor | 1 | 151 |

*N=90

TABLE 6
DELIVERY/METHOD OF INSTRUCTION OF SERVICE-ORIENTED PROGRAMS

| Method of Instruction | Number of Programs* | Program Appendix ID Number |
|---|---|---|
| Home Visit | 36 | 60, 61, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 70, 73, 74, 75, 78, 82, 88, 91, 94, 105, 107, 109, 111, 118, 119, 121, 125, 120, 129, 132, 133, 135, 136, 140, 142, 143, 144, 146, 148 |
| Discussion Groups | 22 | 60, 64, 79, 82, 83, 85, 86, 96, 105, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 119, 134, 139, 140, 142, 153, 155 |
| Workshops | 27 | 59, 61, 63, 66, 90, 107, 108, 109, 110, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 135, 136, 137 |
| Parent Participation in Classroom/School | 18 | 61, 63, 71, 72, 74, 77, 79, 81, 82, 87, 90, 94, 95, 106, 103, 130, 132, 153 |
| Course or Lecture Series | 9 | 58, 62, 80, 92, 96, 103, 149, 150, 151 |

*N=112

TABLE 7
CHARACTERISTICS OF PROGRAM STAFF OF SERVICE-ORIENTED PROGRAMS

| Characteristic | | Number of Programs* | Program Appendix ID Number |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ethnicity: | Black | 3 | 58, 77, 92 |
| | Hispanic | 3 | 91, 92, 103 |
| | Anglo | | 58, 92, 103 |
| | Dep. on Client population | | 59 |
| Sex: | Female | 8 | 58, 65, 74, 77, 83, 86, 92, 95 |
| | Male | 5 | 58, 65, 86, 92, 95 |
| Age: | 20-50 | 1 | 95 |

*N=20

teaching with teacher (71), learns content via individual training (77, 90, 106), learns via parent-teacher conference (82), or receives counseling or social service referral (79, 81, 153).

Finally, nine programs conducted parent education courses or lecture series led by a teacher/instructor, professor and translator, or counselor. The average length of each class period was two hours. Sample content topics were: reinforcement of reading skills (62), behavioral approach to child rearing (151), and child development (58).

5. Staff

Few published reports document size and actual characteristics of program staff. Table 5 lists the range of parent trainers as they are identified in program reports (home visitor, project staff, teacher, community coordinator, instructor, counselor, and etc.) In addition, twelve programs identified consultants used in program activities. These included a nurse (82), counselor or mental health professional (73, 91, 114), physician (149), bilingual or language consultant (92, 112), curriculum specialist (68, 74), child development professional (112), and unspecified consultants in two cases (107, 70). Two others mentioned the use of volunteers (108, 137). Only 11 of the 90 programs presented data on sex, ethnicity, and age of staff personnel or consultants (see Table 7). Thirteen programs described staff selection criteria or desired background training for recruitment (58, 59, 60, 73, 74, 82, 83, 91, 92, 111, 115, 116). Only two programs described selection procedures (95, 117). A few programs made reference to training provided by the program for staff after recruitment.

Some programs report information about staff size. It is very often unclear, however, when a report lists, for example, two

"instructors," whether or not those two staff members were actually employed full-time, how much work time was spent in direct instructional contact with parents, whether or not work time was spent in other activities relating to parent education, and whether or not work time was spent on other functions of the larger agency. Almost two-thirds of the programs reporting size of staff (N = 34 out of 55) have 5 instructors or less; all programs reporting size of administrative staff (N = 34) had 3 or less administrative staff. Because the implications of this information in terms of program size and amount and intensity of parent contact is unclear, these data are presented without further elaboration in Table 8.

6. Evaluation

Only a very small number of the 87 programs identified in the FACS review have a clear research orientation (58, 59, 69). The remainder were designed primarily to provide a service. This service orientation explains, in part, the less than formal approach taken towards evaluation of program effects from the standpoint of rigorous research design. In the few published documents which contain information about the person conducting the evaluation (N = 33) the majority (N = 25) report internal evaluations, e.g., by program staff (68, 71, 72, 77, 91, 96, 106, 107, 108, 120, 125), or by document author (58, 59, 65, 67, 76, 83, 85, 86, 94, 95, 114, 116, 151, 155). The ramining eight identify an external evaluator (61, 82, 88, 92, 104) or consultant in combination with program staff (60, 128, 129) as persons conducting the evaluations.

In reports which include some form of evaluation component, the criteria and the methodology for determing impact vary widely. This

TABLE 8
SIZE OF PROGRAM STAFF OF SERVICE-ORIENTED PROGRAMS

| Size | Number of Programs* | Program Appendix ID Number |
|---|---|---|
| Full Time Equivalents: Total Staff | | |
| 1-5 | 26 | 58, 62, 65, 72, 77, 83, 85, 86, 91, 106, 111, 112, 118, 120, 121, 127, 129, 131, 133, 136, 137, 138, 139, 141, 144, 149, 151 |
| 6-10 | 20 | 64, 73, 95, 104, 105, 107, 108, 119, 125, 126, 128, 130, 134, 135, 140, 142, 143, 145, 146, 148 |
| More than 10 | 12 | 60, 61, 68, 75, 88, 92, 103, 122, 123, 132, 144, 147 |
| Full Time Equivalents: Administrators | | |
| 1-3 | 34 | 59, 60, 61, 72, 73, 88, 103, 104, 105, 108, 118, 119, 121, 122, 123, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 135, 137, 140, 141, 142, 144, 145, 146, 147 |
| Full Time Equivalents: Instructional Staff | | |
| 1-5 | 34 | 58, 59, 62, 65, 73, 77, 83, 85, 86, 91, 103, 105, 106, 107, 116, 118, 119, 120, 121, 124, 125, 126, 128, 130, 133, 134, 136, 137, 138, 139, 141, 145, 148, 151 |
| 6-10 | 10 | 72, 88, 95, 104, 108, 135, 140, 142, 143, 146 |
| More than 10 | 11 | 60, 61, 68, 74, 75, 92, 122, 123, 132, 144, 147 |

*N=147

variety reflects the following assumptions which tend to underlie parent education programs: (1) that efforts are directed at parents, who are ostensibly performing some aspect of their parenting functions poorly or who could perform it better, (2) that parent education as an intervention will improve parent role performance, and (3) that this change in the parent or in the environment provided by the parent will benefit the child in some fashion and be reflected in improvement in some aspect of the child's behavior. The treatment (educational activities) is directed at the parent, who provides the child's primary environment. The ultimate target, though, is the child.

Twenty-two of the programs sought to identify outcomes in parents only (see Table 9). Another nine used some form of pre- and post-measurement to assess parental change. Ten programs relied on parent statements of benefit or satisfaction in the form of questionnaires, checklists and the like. Ten other programs utilized records or frequency counts of (a) parental attendance at parent education functions, (b) amount of contact with staff, or (c) of material usage. Staff observations of parental skill gain were still another method used to gauge success (reported by four program). Six programs used two or more of these methods in combination (122, 124, 125, 127, 128, 136).

Very few programs expressed expected outcomes for children only (N = 8). A pre-post evaluation design was reported by five programs, age or norm referenced comparison by one, and the monitoring of individual child progress by two.

About one third (N = 29) of the 87 programs sought to evaluate outcomes in both parents and children. Only six of these assessed both parents and children for some aspect of gain or change on both

TABLE 9
EVALUATION FOCUS AND PROCEDURES OF SERVICE-ORIENTED PROGRAMS

| Focus and Procedures | Number of Programs* | Program Appendix ID Number |
|---|---|---|
| Focused on Parents Only | | |
| Pre-Post Measurement of: | | |
| . attitude change toward parenting | 3 | 83, 96, 127 |
| . knowledge gain about parenting | 6 | 71, 108, 110, 114, 124, 128 |
| Self-Report of Gain or Satisfaction | 10 | 66, 71, 92, 122, 124, 125, 126, 134, 135, 136 |
| Records or Frequency Counts of Attendance, Parent-Staff Contact, or Use of Materials | 10 | 119, 122, 125, 127, 128, 135, 136, 138, 139, 147 |
| Observations of Skill Change | 4 | 71, 120, 124, 125 |
| Focused on Children Only | | |
| Pre-Post Measurement of: | | |
| . change in academic or cognitive skill | 5 | 77, 80, 85, 131, 155 |
| . change in social behavior | 2 | 59, 155 |
| Age or Norm Referenced Comparison | 1 | 65 |
| Monitoring of Individual Progress | 2 | 59, 73 |
| Focused on Parents and Children | | |
| Pre-Post Measures for both | 6 | 95, 107, 118, 119, 129, 153 |
| Parents Tested Pre-Post; Children Evaluated Informally | 6 | 68, 74, 105, 112, 116, 151 (post only) |
| Children Tested Pre-Post; Parents Evaluated Informally | 10 | 61, 75, 76 (post only), 88, 94, 110, 123, 130, 132, 133, 137, 140, 142, 144, 145, 146 |
| Filmed Interaction | 1 | 78 |

*N=66

pre- and post-measures, while one evaluated both via filmed interactions. Another six tested parents pre and post, but employed less formal methods to assess the children, such as staff observation or behavior records with frequency counts. Most of the 29 programs (N = 16) evaluated children with a pre-post evaluation design, and parents were evaluated less formally, e.g., observation, exit interview, post questionnaire. This more frequent use of tests for evaluating children probably reflects the greater availability of standardized instruments for children.

No evaluation sections at all were present in five published documents (62, 63, 66, 81, 106); four did not report results due to unfinished assessment procedures (61, 72, 86, 112). Ten program reports contained evaluation sections which were confusing or unclear (60, 61, 64, 67, 70, 79, 105, 111, 143, 148).

Almost all of the published documents which contained some type of evaluation section or some mention of outcomes report success. In some cases, claims for positive outcomes are not verified by any kind of measurement--no matter how formal or informal--but, rather, by opinion of the report's author (66, 71, 88, 91, 92, 96, 106, 108, 110, 155). Ten programs report conclusive results on the basis of test data subjected to statistical analyses (59, 65, 68, 77, 83, 85, 95, 107, 151, 153). Among these, only four programs had a control group (68, 77, 83, 85). Two programs out of the ninety studied admitted failure (75, 105).

The greater availability of standardized instruments for children as compared to adults probably accounts for their greater usage. Standardized achievement tests were used in some program evaluation reports (61, 68, 72, 75, 77, 80, 82, 98, 101, 108), and tests of

cognitive functioning in others (68, 69, 92, 118, 119, 123). Examples are the Wide-Range Achievement Test (75), Peabody Picture Vocabulary (61, 72, 77, 88), or the Denver Developmental Screening Test (82).

Many programs used staff-designed project instruments which reflected both the variety and the local and specific nature of the information sought. Questionnaires and surveys were the kinds of instruments commonly developed (60, 67, 74, 82, 83, 86, 104, 105, 110, 118, 123, 125). Other programs devised checklists and rating scales (76, 96, 114, 122).

7. Summary

As a result of FACS' examination of the eighty-seven service-oriented parent education programs, several concluding statements can be made with respect to the findings. First, most of the programs were basically designed to be short-term, small in scope, and located within some type of educational institution, e.g., a public school preschool or day care center. Most of the programs primarily have a strong service orientation as opposed to research focus. The information presented in each of the program document reports is often incomplete; overall, available data across programs is highly inconsistent, e.g., some reports include statements about goals for children whereas many do not.

The most frequently reported data is with respect to the main program objective, which characteristically related to some aspect of parent behavior. On the basis of goals for parents, programs appear to cluster into three primary groupings: (1) Parent Education for Teaching, (2) Parent Education for Parenting, and (3) Parent Education for Self-Development. Goals mentioned in the program reports and the criteria

for judging program success both relate to the basic tenet of these programs; i.e., some form of direct intervention with parents with the ultimate intended beneficiary being the child. Therefore, in addition to explicit objectives for parents, many programs have either explicit or implicit goals for children. In addition, a few programs list other related goals, e.g., goals for teachers.

Program eligibility criteria, selection and recruitment procedures, and specific characteristics of parent participants are not well documented. Generally though, most programs appear to be directed toward low-income mothers of preschool children.

Methods of delivering parent education within programs are highly variable. The home visit is the more common approach, along with the workshop and the discussion group. A less frequent approach is some form of "educational" participation by the parent in the school or classroom, or the course or lecture series. Many programs combine two or more delivery methods, although one is usually predominant.

Noticeably absent is data concerning parent education program staff. It appears that parent instruction is usually conducted by professionals or paraprofessionals according to the descriptive labels used, but precise documentation of program staff characteristics in terms of background, training and professional experience is largely unreported.

The evaluation section of published reports usually contain information that is either incomplete or absent altogether. Among reports which do include evaluation information, most conduct assessment activities internally, and informally, using a wide variety of criteria and methodologies. Some programs seek to identify outcomes in both

parents and children; others focus on one or the other exclusively. Interestingly, though, almost all programs imply or report outright that program efforts were successful, but only in ten cases were claims substantiated by statistical analyses and data findings. Among these, only four had a well-defined control group.

F. Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations

As we have shown, the conceptual reality we call "parent education" derives its present form from a number of influences. Historically, parent education for the middle class focused on upgrading the home environment, while parent education for the poor was part of an effort intended to mainstream immigrant families into American society. These related trends towards bettering the home environment and the concern for social reform which started in the 1880's remain the central elements for many currently operating parent education programs. The knowledge accumulated during the last few decades, and the increased prestige and influence of social scientists, helped establish a theoretical rationale for including parents in a variety of institutional settings providing services to children. Finally, the social reform movement of the sixties, fanned by increasing demands from minorities and the poor, generated the compensatory education efforts of these last two decades. These efforts have been seen as answers to demands to respond to school failure, to demands for an increase in the level and quality of services to families in trouble, and to demands by minorities and the poor for greater power over forces impinging upon their lives. In institutions which serve families and children, these factors converged to give rise to parent involvement and parent education.

The analysis of parent education as a separately definable and conceptually clear entity proved to be a difficult task. Very visibly

associated in the recent past with the education establishment, parent education efforts have been linked with additional activities encompassing other parent roles in relation to that setting, such as decision-maker. Parent education can, however, occur in relative isolation, having an existence completely independent from other parent activities within the host establishment. Parent education, defined as those activities which use educational techniques to effect change in parent role performance, deals with a variety of specific aspects of the parent role, such as controller-discipliner, moral developer, or teacher. Parent education can address itself to any one or combination of these role functions. The underlying assumptions which are at the root of parent education efforts today seem to reflect the various historical and social antecedent influences. Some programs attempt to help parents who are functioning well to perform some aspect of their role of parent even better. Other programs attempt to modify the behavior of parents in some area that is assumed to be poorly enacted or in need of improvement. Similarly, some programs are remedial efforts toward solution of an obvious child problem via the parent; other programs exist not for remedial purposes, but solely for enrichment.

The FACS staff reviewed a number of reports of parent education programs and the major research reviews during the first phase of the project.[2]

The major research overviews located by the FACS staff dealt with the proliferation of efforts to involve parents within the compensatory education movement of the 1960's. These programs have been examined

[2]Programs for parents of the handicapped were examined as a separate subset, and discussed in a Progress Report in February 1978. These programs are funded by a variety of sources and range in size, delivery approach, intensity, etc., but are all ultimately directed at helping the parent deal more effectively with a particular handicapping condition of the child.

in depth by a number of professionals within the research community. The resultant reviews summarize the major empirical findings, and a number of general statements can be made about the programs examined. Most of these programs are directed toward low income parents, focused mainly on the parents' role as their child's primary teachers, and are based within the public school or other educational institution, such as Day Care or Nursery Schools. Though they vary in a number of ways, they focus primarily on low income or "disadvantaged" clients and are, basically, remedial efforts directed toward a specific child problem (school failure). Many of these programs are largely funded by the federal government, and are designed to answer questions about effectiveness and about implementation on a larger scale. Many have mandated parent involvement components which include parent education efforts. Parent education activities, therefore, do not occur in isolation, but in conjunction with other involvement activities and with other roles in which the parent might engage in relation to the institution. Many programs evaluate the effects of the totality of parent involvement, of which parent education is but one form. Thus, results do not provide unequivocal evidence as to the effectiveness of parent education independently. As a general indication of effects, however, these programs have been relatively successful in the short run. Recently collected longitudinal data has shown them to be successful over time as well, as reflected by gains in cognitive functioning and school achievement that under certain conditions have been maintained for up to ten years.

The research reviews suggest that programs likely to produce cognitve and educational gains in children are carefully planned,

include a structured curriculum, have an educational focus, and include activities that engage parents and children together in the home. Programs found to be successful were likely to be intensive and to have lasted at least a year.

With the background of these conclusions derived from available research on the effectiveness of parent education programs, we turn now to an examination of the kinds of programs in operation that were designed primarily for service rather than to answer research questions. The available reports (DRs) of service-oriented programs represent probably no more than a small part of the total number of programs in operation. The motivation to write and publish a report varies from program to program, leading to variability in the amount and quality of the information contained in the reports. To study these limitations, however, was precisely one of the objectives of this review. These reports constitute the only evidence available to document the range and variety of parent education programs as they were actually implemented throughout the country.

For this purpose review, 87 programs reported in the last six or seven years were located. These programs were found to vary according to many dimensions, one being "goals for parents." On the basis of these stated goals and objectives, they appear to cluster into three groups: (1) Parent Education for Teaching, where the goal is to improve the role performance or skills of the parent as teacher, which is assumed to benefit the child directly by improving his cognitive functioning and/or school-related skills and achievement. Many of these programs are modest approximations of the models shown to be successful in the research review. (2) Parent Education for Parenting, where the goal

is to enhance the development or improve the role performance of the parent as a parent, assumed to benefit the child by improving the parent-child relationship. (3) Parent Education for Self-Development, where the goals of programs grouped into this category are to help in the development of parents as a persons, and to improve their competence in their interaction with their children's school and the community. These goals are assumed to indirectly benefit the child by changing his/her parent as a person or as a school participant, or improving his/her environment in the school, classroom, and community.

These programs are shorter-term and smaller in scope than the programs included in the major research reviews, and have a strong service, as opposed to research, orientation. They appear to be adaptations to localized conditions and very few are designed as models or methods for replication. Program goals, which provided the basis for the generated categories, appear to span a broader range of parent roles than those addressed by the larger programs. In the case of these small programs, the assumptions which underlie program goals are not often directly spelled out, nor are they substantiated by needs assessment procedures. It would appear, however, that these smaller programs span the range of purposes from remedial in intent (in response to specific child or family problems) to enrichment in nature (to help parents and families functioning well to function better) in contrast to the more limited focus of larger programs (school failure).

Like the larger programs discussed by major reviewers, the great majority of smaller scale programs reported in the literature are based within educational institutions. A few of the small ones, however, are found located within other settings as well: library, temple,

mental health center, and the like. These few exceptions hint at a broader range of settings in which parent education might be found; this broader range was confirmed in a survey of programs in Austin, Texas, reported in Section III.

The compensatory education school-based programs are normally directed toward low income parents (mothers) of preschool children. Smaller programs tended to follow this trend, although a few were designed for different clientele. In forming a picture of the current state of knowledge on the basis of the literature, information about eligibility criteria, client selection and recruitment, and specific characteristics of parents who eventually participate are missing pieces of the larger puzzle.

There is also insufficient information concerning the individuals who carry out parent education. There appears to be a variety of professionals and paraprofessionals from various backgrounds and disciplines who conduct parent education. There is no consistency between programs in the type of professional who is selected as most appropriate to educate parents. In fact, there is very little information to document the actual characteristics of the parent educators in terms of ethnicity, sex, expertise, etc. Likewise, there appears to be very little documentation that the parent educators received any particular training to work with parents, and relatively no information on how this training (for trainers) is imparted or by whom.

Another shortcoming of the current state of knowledge has to do with the factors that account for the great variability among programs. Each individual program is a combination of specific objectives, a given delivery system, selected instructional techniques, a certain

target group, a given setting. Each program is the product of choices between some alternative ways of doing parent education and some alternative primary targets. The factors accounting for these choices are seldom reported. Programs in the real world start and operate within certain restrictions, including the already existing constituency of the host agency, and guidelines from the funding agency. Within these boundaries, many factors influence decisions among alternatives that shape the program and contribute to its likely impact.

Further, the factors that explain the survival of some programs when faced with stiff competition for scarce resources are not explored. The expenditure of social resources in the form of money and time must be explained in terms of the benefits derived by all individual participants, and by the agencies as social entities. The factors that account for the ability to generate support not only from actual or potential clients, but also from other influential individuals and agencies, and the relationship between the program and the agency of which the program is but one component are probably critical in determing program continuation. At some level there must be a belief or conviction that a given program will have some impact that will tend to support the performance of the family, and some form of evidence to this effect must be present.

A major distinction between the large and small programs appears with regard to evaluation. As noted previously, some programs were designed with research questions in mind relating to program effectiveness for a narrow range of mostly school-related criteria. Evidence indicates a trend toward success in these cases. Smaller, more service-oriented programs have faulty or unclear evaluation assessments

often with incomplete information. Program reports and evaluations are designed and written by those who have the greatest stake in the success of the program--the program staff or administrators. This pattern of evaluative practices has led to a tendency best characterized as "doomed to success" (Stanford Research Institute Report, 1973). Only two programs out of the eight-seven reviewed admitted failure. Further, the assessment of program effects often used subjective impressions as results. In many cases continuing participation of parents was considered sufficient proof that the program was effective. While these measures could in fact indicate success of a program, it is difficult to determine the actual impact of the program. A complication is that program procedures or manipulation were seldom checked to determine how they were perceived by participants. Thus, the available reports indicate only that some activities took place, that most participants seemed to be satisfied or expressed satisfaction in questionnaires administered by program staff, and that the program staff for the most part was also satisfied. The impact of programs (beyond providing satisfaction) is unclear.

The most rigorous evaluations of parent education programs have sought to measure the impact of the educational intervention either directly in changes in behavior of the parents or indirectly as reflected by changes in behavior of the child. The mediating processes in many cases are simply assumed to have taken place. Changes in the child are used as evidence that the hypothesized changes in parental behavior occurred. The actual manipulation, the interaction between parent and parent educator is often described in generic terms such as, "the parent educator leads discussion groups with participants" or

"the parent educator demonstrates educational materials at home in weekly visits." The assumption that exposure to certain concepts or techniques will result in learning is made in many programs. Usually in a group setting, using some instructional technique, parents are exposed to alternative ways of dealing with children. Whether that learning, if any, will result in changes performance in a different setting is often assumed but seldom determined.

These restricted views of program evaluation are characteristic of the programs currently reported in the literature. The choice of outcome measures is generally restricted to the participants or their children, and they normally include some form of questionnaire designed to assess participant's satisfaction in addition to learning. The rigorous and limited evaluation designs preferred by researchers and the more general and impressionistic evaluations favored by program staff should give way to a conception of impact instread of the more common concept of effectiveness. Impact as a concept implies an openness to consider a great range of possible effects of the program including intended as well as unintended outcomes. This concept of impact goes beyond the so called "goal free" evaluation approach pioneered by Scriven (1973). A goal free evaluation design does not seek to determine the attainment of predetermined objectives defined by program administrators, but rather attempts to examine the program from the point of view of the client or learner. Actual effects are determined free from the contamination inherent in direct contact between the professional evaluator and the professional program administrator. An assessment of impact goes beyond the goal-free model to an examination of the program as a system in which individuals engage in interactions

that should have reciprocal effects. It recognizes that learning takes place in all the participants, although one or more may not be formally defined as a "learner."

The tentative nature of the evidence offered by researchers about the effectiveness of parent education programs directly contradicts a clear trend towards the continuation and even increase in the number and variety of these programs. The great majority of programs identified in the reports of the literature (and in the survey of parent education in Austin by Project FACS described in Section III), do not meet the requirements that Goodson and Hess (1976) and Gordon (1978) have listed as necessary for success. The level of intensity, the duration and degree of structure in these programs do not match those that have been demonstrated to be effective. The question arises as to why such significant expenditure of time and money continues. A cynical answer might be that the so called "parent educators" are successful "con artists" who generate and keep jobs that do not really provide a return for the clients, and that participants are left with ephemeral feelings of competence that fade once their participation ends. It is conceivable that a few operators could get away with that deception once or twice, but the continuation of the same participants over time and the repeated waves of new satisfied clients weakens this explanation.

What, then, does contribute to the relative strength of this trend towards more parent education programs? The survey of the literature by FACS staff has revealed that one place the answer will not be found is in available reports of programs.

The foregoing discussion about the popularity and likely increase of parent education programs, coupled with serious gaps in the available

literature points towards both the content of our inquiry and the approach necessary to carry it out. There is a need to document the impact of these small scale, service-oriented programs. The approach to be used should look at each program as a system that can be described and studied in terms of its elements as well as a system which interacts with the other systems that exist at the community level.

A systems approach such as that advocated by Bronfenbrenner (1976) and by Gordon (1978) describes educational environments as a nested arrangement of structures, each contained within the next. It is possible to concentrate on the study and description of these structures at different levels. A parent education program can be conceived as a system. This system exists and relates to other systems in which the same or other participants interact. The relationships between these various systems is also conceived as a system, but at a higher level. In Bronfenbrenner's terms:

> A micro-system is an immediate setting containing the learner (i.e., home, day care center, classroom, etc.). A setting is defined as a place in which the occupants engage in particular activities in particular roles (e.g., parent, teacher, pupil, etc.) for particular periods of time. These are the elements of the setting.
>
> The meso-system comprises the interrelations amond the major settings containing the learner at a particular point in his or her life. In sum, the meso-system is the system of micro-systems (Bronfenbrenner, 1976, p. 163).

An inquiry conducted at the micro-system level studies the parent education program as the primary setting in which learning takes place. The parent education program, treated as a micro-system, can be described in terms of the elements which make up that system and the interrelationships between the elements. At the meso-system level, the interrelationships and reciprocal influences between selected systems in the

community can be examined. Participants' interaction in settings other than the parent education program can be explored to determine possible influences of the program.

The field study method and in depth interviews with program participants can generate information that will permit the analysis of programs as micro-systems and also the examination or search for reciprocal influences between these micro-systems and other systems in the community. This is the meso-system level of analysis. In particular, an exploratory study should examine the reciprocal influences between (a) program and host agency, and (b) program and other alternative parent support networks. The first area represents a concern with the role of the host agency in determing the shape of the program and the effects of the program on the responsiveness of that agency to community needs. The second area recognizes that parent education programs are not the sole source of information and support for parents and families. The impact of the program can be examined in terms of the relationships between parents and these other support systems.

Closely related to the influence of the host agency on the program is the exploration of the role of parent education leaders, defined as those individuals who are the driving force within or outside the agencies. An examination of their idealogy and motivation should provide some clues to explain program variability. These leaders' experiences, education, and professional networks are as important as their beliefs and attitudes about education in general, parent education, parents and children, etc. A better understanding of these individuals will provide clues to trends and problems expected to influence parent education in the future.

## III. A SURVEY OF PARENT EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN AUSTIN

A. Objectives of the Survey: The survey of Parent Education Programs in Austin, Texas, was designed to serve as a pilot test for a more extensive survey to be conducted in the state and region. The pilot survey was expected (1) to help identify alternative strategies for locating parent education programs, (2) to test a survey questionnaire, and (3) to design a storage and retrieval system for the information to be gathered in the full survey. On the basis of discussions with NIE staff, and after examining reports of programs in the literature, a set of dimensions were identified for inclusion in the survey (Appendix C). At the suggestion of NIE staff, the mail questionnaire was replaced by a face-to-face interview in order to determine the kinds of information available to program personnel. The interviewing process was also used to determine who in the programs should be identified as the best/ideal respondent for a mail survey. As a result of this change in strategy, the product of the pilot survey is a preliminary form for a mail questionnaire that has not been tested. Likewise, the suggestions for an information storage and retrieval system will depend on the final form that the mail questionnaire will take. However, as a result of these efforts, descriptive data about local programs has been generated. In addition, the interview schedule for program administrators has been revised and tested.

B. Development of the Survey Instrument: The FACS literature review led to the identification of eight primary areas where detailed information was necessary in order to understand the operation of a program. These areas were used to analyze the eighty-seven programs discussed

in the previous section of this report. These same areas suggested dimensions that should be covered in a comprehensive survey of parent education programs.

The survey was intended originally to pilot test a mail questionnaire form that could be used later in a full scale regional survey. Negotiations with NIE staff and consultants led to a substantial modification of the objectives and activities of the project. Instead of testing a mail questionnaire form it was decided to conduct face-to-face interviews in order to determine the types of information available to program administrators who would be the likely respondents of a mail survey. The questionnaire form that had been drafted (See Appendix C) was modified into an interview schedule. After several in-house revisions it was tested with three respondents. On the basis of their responses, it was changed to accomodate a more natural flow of topics. The final version of the interview schedule appears in Appendix C.

The interviewing process and the information generated in the interactions with respondents has produced two kinds of data. The first type of information permits a description of the state of the art of parent education in Austin, which can be contrasted with information from the published reports about programs elsewhere in the country. A description of specific programs is presented in the next section following the procedures used to locate parent education programs.

The second type of data generated from the interviews provides some clear directions for future research efforts in Texas and the region. The implications for the proposed full scale survey will be

presented in the last part of the report.

C. Locating Parent Education Programs and Respondents: In order to describe the parent education programs currently operating in Austin, it was necessary first to locate the programs and identify a respondent for each. Since normally there is no single directory where this information can be found, a number of alternative strategies are necessary to achieve a reasonable coverage of an area. The following sources of information were examined:

1. Public Human Service Agencies. A number of public agencies were contacted by telephone, and asked about specific units or programs likely to serve parents. These agencies included the Austin Independent School District, City and County Mental Health-Mental Retardation Agency, the local office of the State Department of Human Resources (formerly Welfare Department).

2. Private Human Service Agencies. Local private agencies were contacted by telephone and specific programs and individuals were singled out for further contacts. One project of the local United Way in association with other human service organizations and the local newspaper has been to compile and publish a Directory of Human Services. This directory and a central information number provided additional leads to programs and agencies likely to sponsor parent education activities.

3. Metropolitan Telephone Directory. The Yellow Pages contain partial listings of social service agencies and were used to confirm some of the leads obtained through other methods.

The agencies and programs identified through these sources were contacted by telephone, specific parent education programs were identified,

and the names of key contact people were obtained (See Appendix D). With this information in hand, a brief explanation of the purpose of the survey was sufficient to obtain appointments for an interview with a FACS staff member. No one who was contacted refused to be interviewed; there were two cancellations due to time conflicts; one program of the original list of 33 was found to be outside of the concerns of FACS, and seven programs were not contacted due to time limitations. A total of twenty-three program directors/coordinators were interviewed (Appendix D).

It is important to note that complete coverage of all operating programs in any given geographical area may be difficult if not impossible. This is due in part to the fact that parent education programs may be offered by individuals on an irregular basis, and that not all churches, agencies and clubs that sponsor programs belong to groups or communicate with other similar programs. For example, Parent Effectiveness Training (PET) has been offered in the past by private individual trainers licensed by the national PET organization; however, no current PET programs were located for this survey. This may be due to the Project's failure to locate a PET program or to the absence of any ongoing activities. The programs included in the current survey, however, appear to represent the vast majority of the activities concerning parent education in the Austin community.

A most fortunate development in Austin is the existence of the Parent Education Association, a collective of representatives from agencies and programs interested in parent education. The Association has a part time staff member whose job is to keep up with what is taking place locally with respect to parent education. After the

initial list was compiled she was used to check on the comprehensiveness of the coverage. The existence of the Parent Education Association was known to the FACS staff in advance of the survey, but it was not used to generate the list to test a procedure that could work in communities without a similar organization.

In all cases the interviews were conducted in the offices of the programs being surveyed and at the convenience of the respondent. In two cases the interview had to be suspended temporarily and continued the next day due to last minute interruptions. All interviewees agreed to be tape recorded and assurances were made to interviewees that their opinions would be kept confidential if they so desired. In several cases equipment failures prevented an exact transcript being produced. In all cases the interviewers were taking notes of major points, so that no fundamental data was lost. The interviews lasted on the average about one hour. In some cases there were frequent short interruptions. The longest interview was about one hour and forty minutes and the shortest about thirty minutes. Brief summaries of each interview describing the program are presented in Appendix D.

D. Description of Local Parent Education Programs: The interviews with administrative personnel in the twenty-two parent education programs and one coordinator (Parent Education Association staff) were analyzed by looking at some of the same dimensions which were used to analyze the descriptive reports in the literature. Among the areas examined were location of program base, objectives for parents and children, information about staffing and participants, program activities and evaluation. The data were also examined for any trends which might be at variance with the literature reports of programs. Brief

descriptions of the Austin programs for which interviews have been conducted are included in Appendix D. A sample transcript is included in Appendix E. Based on the interviews, Programs (3)[3] and (4) do not appear to be relevant to the FACS project; the focus of both programs is Education for Parenthood and the primary population served is high school students. However, until more information is gathered, they will be considered part of the project and will be refered to where appropriate. Program (10) is still in the planning stages and has not yet held a first meeting. Program (21) is the Parenting Office, concerned with coordinating Austin parent education programs. Since it is not a parent education program per se, it will not be included in subsequent discussions.

Although this preliminary inspection was superficial due to time limitations, it did bring to light some interesting findings. Less than half of the 22 programs were located within educational institutions (N = 10). Specifically, six were based in the public school system: two at the elementary level, three at the high school level, and one at both elementary and secondary levels. One program each was based in a nursery school, small college campus, and a community school; one represented the Austin Head Start and Title XX Day Care Center Parent Education efforts. The figure "ten" may be deceptive, however; one program at the elementary level (5) sponsored in different locations, another in four high schools (4), another (2) at ten different sites and another (1) at 12 sites. In total, there were ten

---

[3] The numbers in parenthesis correspond to the program number as reported in Appendix D.

school-based programs with replications at forty-four sites. The remaining programs (N = 12) were based in non-educational institutions: social service agencies (N = 5), volunteer organizations (N = 5), and churches (N = 2).

The ratio of educationally-based programs compared to those which were non-educationally based is much smaller than would have been predicted by the vast number of school based programs reported in the descriptive reports and research oriented documents in the literature. A sizable majority of programs reported in the literature were based in educational institutions; slightly less than half of the programs located in Austin were educationally based. This pattern seems to indicate that programs located in educational settings were over-represented in the reports found in the literature.[4] Further, a greater range of non-educational institutions were found to carry out parent education programs than would be expected judging from published reports, thus verifying a prediction advanced in earlier stages of the project. The fact that there is a greater range of community institutions involved in parent education will be an improtant factor in meeting the objectives of the next phase of the FACS project.

In addition to the host agency which provides the setting, programs can be classified on the basis of objectives or goals for parents. The schema evolved from the literature for classifying service-oriented

---

[4]The account presented here includes only those programs for which interviews were conducted. If all the programs so far located in Austin are included, there is an even greater preponderance of non-educationally based programs. Out of thirty-three programs, eleven are based in educational settings, twenty-two in non-educational settings.

programs was applied to the programs in Austin (Parent Education for Teaching, Parent Education for Parenting, and Parent Education for Self-Development). Again, there was considerable variance from the literature in the number of parent education for teaching programs. Only three of the programs investigated in Austin focused exclusively on Parent Education for Teaching (1, 2, 5). Three other programs whose major focus was education for parenting had minor parent education for teaching components (8, 13, 22). Of the three programs in which parents participate only as teachers, all three serve low income parents; of the three programs with both teaching and parenting components, two serve low income parents. The trend, started in the 60's, toward using parent education for teaching as a technique almost exclusively for low income parents appears to be continuing. As was pointed out in the literature review, parent education for teaching is usually designed around an identified need or problem of the child, and the parent participates in a specified way (usually tutoring) to help the child overcome the problem. This trend was also found in the Austin programs. All three parent education for teaching programs targeted a specific child subgroup (poor readers, Spanish language dominant, handicapped or mentally retarded); one out of the three programs with teaching components dealt with problems of handicapped children. These programs were remedial in nature and designed to meet childrens' needs. Parent clients were recruited by selection, outreach activities, or encouragement by the sponsoring institution. This patern of recruitment differs considerably from the groups to be discussed in the following paragraphs, almost all of which have self-selected participants.

The bulk of the programs had objectives for parents in roles other than that of teacher and were targeted toward a variety of parents. Fourteen programs were exclusively parent education for parenting; five programs had parent education for parenting components. Programs for parenting were primarily designed to meet parent, rather than children needs, most were located in non-educational institutions, and most were not designed for any special parent subgroup. Programs of this nature do not actively recruit parents; parents are largely self-selected on the basis of their own needs or interests. The content of the program is less focused than the content of the Parent Education for Teaching programs. Most teach parenting skills; some topics of concern to parents are designed around group members expressed needs or interests; some provide information about child development, and others are designed to develop parenting support networks. The programs which are not exclusively parent education for parenting but which have a Parent Education for Teaching or Parent Education for Self-Development components (2, 8, 13, 16, 22) also focus primarily on parenting skills and child development, although two of these programs focus on classroom related skills.

Five programs had objectives for parents relating to the parents' self-development, particularly in learning to be a better advocate for his child (6, 8, 16, 17, 19). All but one of these programs (19) were directed toward parents of handicapped children. That one exception (19) was organized with the intent of helping mothers upgrade the social status of motherhood by organizing them to change social and cultural attitudes.

Another interesting trend emerged from the inspection of the local,

ongoing programs, related to the key staff persons who directly carry out the parent training. Two interviewees mentioned that the social service agencies which they represent receive frequent requests from many places within the community for consultants or guest speakers for workshops or discussion groups on parenting-related topics. This inter-agency cooperation was evidenced by a number of examples in which one agency carrying out parent education utilized the expertise and man-power from other social service agencies involved in parent education (5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 16, 19, 21). Agencies frequently mentioned as engaging in community and intra-agency parent education were Austin-Travis County Mental Health-Mental Retardation, Planned Parenthood, and the Child and Family Service Agency. The latter frequently conducts one session only workshops in a variety of locations, often churches.

Similarly, professional manpower in the parent education field is not static Some individuals engage in parent education both privately and as agency representatives (5, 12, 15).[5] Indeed, one prominent parent educator works not only privately but also for a community school, for two agencies (11, 15), and for the Parent Education Association in carrying out parent education activities. Thus, the mobility of professional manpower confounds the issue of identifying who, in fact, is sponsoring and carrying out parent education.

Evaluation efforts for programs in Austin ranged from formal testing done by the local school district research and evaluation department, to informal questionnaires, to no evaluation at all. There is insufficient

---

[5]Identification of agency in which parent educators have primary employment.

information to date to rigorously assess the evaluation activities; the discussion here should be considered tentative in nature.

All the educationally-based programs had some type of evaluation. Five programs (1, 2, 4, 6, 9) appear to have formal evaluation programs, most of which use pre and post testing and which look at child-related variables. Two of these programs reported "positive" results (1, 6); three had not yet analyzed the results or did not have them available (2, 4, 9). The five remaining programs in educational settings had informal evaluations and/or unclear evaluation efforts.

Of the twelve non-educationally based programs, evaluation efforts ranged from informal to none. Programs 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, and 20 carried out some form of evaluation, usually requesting information about parental satisfaction with the program. Evaluation methods included questionnaires, informal discussions, and case studies. Programs 16, 19, 21, and 22 had no evaluation activities.

E. Recommendations for a Comprehensive Survey of Parent Education Programs: A survey of parent education programs is a complex activity which should be carried out over time, at various levels, using different respondents and a variety of methods. All the activities recommended below, if carried out, would produce a comprehensive, detailed and in-depth view of the programs and the people engaged in parent education, their hopes, aspirations, and accomplishments. As a result of the pilot survey conducted in Austin and the FACS literature review of parent education reports, it has been concluded that (1) a state and/or region-wide survey of parent education programs should be conducted, and (2) such a survey should take into account factors concerning the depth and scope of different activities presented in the following pages.

The recommendations presented here should be viewed as those steps necessary to gather, store, retrieve, and utilize the survey information to be collected. Several recommendations are made with respect to the order in which the survey activities should proceed. The first phase, locating the programs and initial respondents, should be completed before the other activities can proceed. The activities of the next phase, describing program operations, characteristics of program personnel and program leaders, may be carried out consecutively or concurrently depending on the needs of the project.

1. Locating Programs and Respondents. Conducting a state or regional survey will necessitate locating the myriad of parent education programs currently operating in the survey area. While telephone contacts were used by the FACS project to locate programs in Austin, this most likely would be too time consuming and costly if done on the state or regional level. To increase the efficiency of the process, initial efforts should concentrate on state-level (Texas) organizations that are likely to sponsor, fund, control, or at least be familiar with many local Parent Education efforts. A visit to the state level organization central office will produce information about a number of programs in a wide geographical area. Since many state-level organizations have headquarters in Austin, this fact should facilitate the state-wide data gathering process.

A list of potential initial contact institutions has been developed for Texas. Most of these institutions have counterparts in other states included in the SEDL region (Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, New Mexico), if the survey area is expanded

to include the entire region. The following organizations or their equivalents should be contacted:

1. Texas Education Agency, especially the Office of Federal Allocations, Division of Program Funds Management, Follow Through Programs, Division of Bilingual and Migrant Education, and Education Service Centers (20 regions)
2. Texas Department of Human Resources (formerly the Welfare Department)
3. Texas Department of Health Resources
4. Texas Department of Community Affairs, especially the Economic Opportunity Division, and the Division of Early Childhood Education
5. Texas Municipal League
6. Texas Parent Teacher Association
7. Texas Junior League
8. Texas Child Care 76
9. Texas Association for the Education of Young Children
10. Texas Association for Childhood Education International
11. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Region VI Office

The information gathered from these sources and other similar organizations will constitute a working list of parent education programs which needs to be compiled at the onset of the Parent Education program survey activities. Information to be solicited should include specific program name, the host agency, the address, phone number, and name and title of the contact person.

The compilation of this information in many cases will not necessarily require contacting actual programs.

The information gathered can be used to compile a directory of ongoing parent education programs, program contacts and mailing addresses. Since no such directory is currently available for Texas or the SEDL region, its compilation will be a valuable contribution to the community of parent education practitioners as well as participants. This directory can serve to link together isolated programs to form a communications network. In addition, the directory would lay the groundwork for the next phase of a survey: generating descriptive information about specific programs.

2. Generating Information About Programs. Once a number of programs and potential respondants have been located, the survey activities should proceed to the next step of the investigative process. This step involves gathering descriptive information about programs and program staff. It is recommended that three different conceptual areas be examined in order to generate this information about programs. The first area to be examined is that of program operation, including program activities, participants, etc. The second area is that of program personnel characteristics, including information about administrators, professional and nonprofessional staff, etc. The third area should examine the characteristics, beliefs, and training of parent education leaders, i.e., those individuals responsible for conceptualizing parent education approaches. This area may be especially significant if these key individuals are not part of the program staff, but nonetheless have contributed to shape the local program. Information from these three areas can be gathered independently from one another.

In addition, each area will generate similar and dissimilar types of information about ongoing programs. It is recommended that all three areas be investigated if the intent of the survey effort is to generate comprehensive descriptions of ongoing parent education programs.

In order to examine parent education programs with respect to these areas, a three step process is recommended. The first step is Describing Program Operations. It is recommended that this step precede the remaining two because it will generate information concerning staffing, staff roles, and staff positions in a given program. The second step is Describing Characteristics of Program Personnel. The third step is Describing Characteristics of Parent Education Leaders.

a. Describing Program Operations. A draft of a Program Description Questionnaire (PDQ) has been designed which requests objective information about the program, its purposes, target audience, delivery system, staff, types of activities, etc. (see Appendix F). Prior to developing the PDQ draft, FACS staff pre-tested a form of the instrument by interviewing program administrators in Austin. The results of this effort indicate that the information requested was readily available and accessible. The fact that program personnel appear to have immediate access to data and the fact that such information is public should help insure a fairly high rate of response to program information requests. It is expected that the PDQ may also be completed by staff other than administrators, who also have access to the type of information sought. The PDQ will need to be tested in its present form in order to verify this assertion.

The PDQ has been designed to be mailed; the intended targets are those individuals identified during the first phase of the survey previously described. It is recommended that after the form is mailed

to the respondents, a follow-up mail reminder be sent to attempt to increase the response rate. Telephone contacts could be used also as a follow-up procedure after a predetermined time lapse from the initial mail-out.

In addition to seeking information about parent education program operations, the PDQ asks for additional leads to other such programs, which could increase the number of parent education programs located for the survey. This technique of requesting information about other programs was tested and found to be successful during the interviews conducted by the FACS staff in Austin. For each additional lead, the sequence of mail questionnaire, mail reminder, and telephone follow-up should be indicated if the need exists.

The results of the PDQ, furnished by each program, can be arranged in a form amenable to almost direct transcription into a standard format. This standardized format can constitute the information storage medium as a file of loose-leaf program descriptions. Then information retrieval can be accomplished by assigning each program a code number and by indexing each program according to a set of fixed terms describing major dimensions, e.g., geographical location, sponsorship, major purpose, delivery system, primary target audience, specific activities, etc. The use of these index terms will permit the compilation of information for one directory which includes all programs in consecutive number order and an index section where program numbers are listed according to the descriptor terms used. The directory could be printed using inexpensive photocopy and reduction techniques that do not require typesetting. The master file of one-to-two page program descriptions, would allow for any subset to be

selected for printing as special purpose directories (i.e., only school-based programs, or only programs that use a group discussion format, etc.) This basic form could be easily modified (retyped) to reflect changes in the size or nature of the program along with permitting the removal of programs no longer in operation and the addition of new programs. In a sense, this could become an ever expanding, updated file or data base.

The product of this survey activity would be a data base containing descriptive information about parent education programs. This information can be put in the form of printed Directories, annotated directories containing the actual descriptions of programs and special listing of similar programs by location, type, etc. This information could be of a public nature and available to the programs participating and the educational community in general.

A promising strategy worth exploring and related to this activity involves obtaining the cooperation of organizations with strong public service orientations and volunteer workers. By securing a commitment to use their networks in a collaborative effort, these organizations could request local groups to nominate a "survey committee". These survey committees would be requested to contact programs which would add to the contact list, and actually provide those programs with the PDQ.

Use of the procedures described above requires a budget allocation for such expenses as mailing, local and WATTS lines, limited travel to visit the headquarters of organizations.

b. Describing Program Personnel Characteristics. One of the more puzzling gaps identified in the reports about parent education programas in the literature was the absence of information about parent educators. Their

professional training and education vis-à-vis their specific role in each program are of critical importance for the planning of in-service training programs, the development of suitable training materials, and the provision of technical assistance services. Further, the effect of staff background, training, and characteristics on program operation is unknown. The personal and professional characteristics of program personnel are seldom described despite their importance. A preliminary draft of a Parent Education Program Staff Questionnaire (PSQ), concerning program personnel, has been designed (see Appendix F).

The PSQ requests information about the background and training of each program staff. The information required by the PSQ is more personal in nature than the information requested in the Program Description Questionnaire, and is consequently designed to be answered individually by each staff member rather than by the program administrator.

The information needed to describe parent educators characteristics does not require that every individual in a program be included in the study. Having a comprehensive list of parent education program (generated by phase one), allows for the selection of a representative sample of respondents for purposes of studying parent educators. The use of information generated is different from that about programs. Thus, no need can be anticipated at present to keep the information obtained in any form other than on coded key-punched computer cards.

The product of this survey activity could be a data base containing information about parent education practitioners. This information can be used to (1) generate a profile of parent educators, and (2) identify needs and concerns for training, and specify preferred formats

for training and other areas of interest. This information should be made available in the form of publications that summarize the results of the questionnaires without identifying the respondents.

c. Describing the Characteristics of Parent Education Leaders. Another group of subjects that can be identified for further research are local parent education leaders, i.e., those individuals responsible for the development and implementation of parent education programs. They are often the actual program administrators, but in some cases they may occupy other roles. Examination of their personal and professional backgrounds, educational ideology, attitudes, beliefs, etc., requires a slightly different approach than the one suggested above. Since the information requested is in part subjective and personal, and may require probing on the part of the investigator, it is recommended that individual and/or group interviews be used to gather this information. A preliminary list of topics for the interview schedule is included in Appendix F. The information generated by this approach is expected to provide some clues as to the impact of different philosophies and models of parent education on program operation. The basic list of parent education programs generated by phase one can be used as a basis for obtaining a representative sample of such individuals.

The product of this survey activity could be a data base containing detailed interview data about parent education leaders at the local level. This information can be used to (1) generate profiles of parent education professionals, and (2) identify areas of concern, future trends, or directions of parent education.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY


Abeson, Alan, and Jeffrey Zettel. "Quiet Revolution: Handicapped Children Act of 1975," Exceptional Children, 44, 2: 115-128, October 1977.

Adkins, Dorothy C. "Programs of Head Start Parent Involvement in Hawaii." A section of the Final Report for 1969-70. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the AERA, New York, New York, February 1971. (ED 048 935)

Adreani, Arnold J., and Robert McCaffrey. Improving Child Management Practices of Parents and Teachers. Maxi I Practicum. Final Report. October 1974. (ED 106 729)

Andrews, Susan B., and others. Fourth-year Report: New Orleans Parent-Child Development Center. New Orleans, LA: Parent Child Development Center, March 1975. (ED 106 382)

Arnow, Beth. Bilingual/ESL Programs for Migrant Children. New Mexico State University, March 1977. (ED 134 351)

Arnstein, R. "A Ladder of Citizen Participation," Journal of The American Institute of Planners, 35, 4: 216-224, 1960.

Askins, Billy E., and others. Clovis-Portales Bilingual Early Childhood Program: Second Year Evaluation Study (1973-74). Lubbock, TX: Adobe Educational Services, Clovis Public Schools, New Mexico, May 1974. (ED 103 108)

Baenninger, Louise P., and Loretta I. Ulmer. School Homework as a Focus of Intervention Between Parents and Children. April 1976. (ED 139 506)

Bell, T. H. "The Child's Right to Have a Trained Parent," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 9, 4: 271-276, May 1975.

Boger, Robert P., and others. Maternal Involvement in Day Care: A Comparison of Incentives. Final Report. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, Institute for Family and Child Study, May 1974. (ED 096 018)

Boger, Robert P., and Mary P. Andrews. Early Social Development: Parent and Child Programs. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, Institute for Family and Child Study, June 30, 1975. (ED 118 240)

Bricker, Diane D., and William A. Bricker. Non-Categorical Education for the Preschool Child. 1975. (ED 112 558)

Brim, O. G. Education for Child Rearing. New York: Free Press, 1959.

Bronfenbrenner, Urie. "Is Early Intervention Effective?" A Report on Longitudinal Evaluations of Preschool Programs, Vol. II. Washington, D.C.: DHEW Publication, 1974.

Bronfenbrenner, Urie. "The Experimental Ecology of Education," Educational Researcher, 5: 5-15, 1976.

Bute Vocational Technical Center. Project to Teach Educational Disadvantaged Parented ABE Skills in Their Own Homes and to Show These Parents How and What to Teach Their Pre-School Children. Bute, MT: Bute Vocational Technical Center, 1973. (ED 109 491)

California State Department. Early Childhood Education in Action: The Second Year. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education, Office of Information/Dissemination, 1975. (ED 118 228)

Carlson, Jon, and Maureen Jarman. "Parent Consulting: Developing Power Bases and Helping People," Psychology in the Schools, 2, 3: 358-364, July 1975.

Casey, Vera M. "High School Parent-Child Education Center," Young Children, 29, 2: 90-95, 1974.

Chilman, Catherine. Parent Participation: Trends and Related Resources. (Draft), 1968.

Chilman, Catherine S. "Some Angles on Parent-Teacher Learning," Childhood Education, 48, 3: 119-125, December 1971.

Chilman, Catherine S. "Programs for Disadvantaged Parents: Some Major Trends and Related Research." In B. Caldwell and H. Ricciuti (eds.), Review of Child Development Research, Vol III. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.

Chow, Stanley, and others. Early Childhood Education. Prep-37. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1972. (ED 067 516)

Clark, Vernon L. Parents as Participants, Partners, and Policy-Makers. (Chapter 8) November 1975. (ED 141 991)

Conant, Margaret M. "Teachers and Parents: Changing Roles and Goals," Childhood Education, 48, 3: 114-118, December 1971. (ED 080 048)

Conley, Virginia. "Come On, Parents, Participate!" Paper presented at "Toward the Competent Parent: An Interdisciplinary Conference on Parenting," Atlanta, GA, February 1977. (ED 138 363)

Cooperative Educational Service Agency. Project Patrol: Evaluation (Second Operational Year) and Proposal for Continuation Grant (Third Operational Year). Gillett, WI: Cooperative Educational Service Agency 3, 1972. (ED 092 215)

Council for Exceptional Children. Parent Education: Exceptional Child Bibliography Series. Arlington, VA: Council for Exceptional Children, Information Center on Exceptional Children, February 1971.

Croake, James W., and Kenneth E. Glover. "A History and Evaluation of Parent Education," Family Coordinator, 26, 2: 151-157, April 1977.

Daniel, Jessica H., and James N. Hyde, Jr. "Working with High-Risk Families," Children Today, 4, 6: 23-25, 36, 1975.

Datta, Lois-ellin. "Parent Involvement in Early Childhood Education: A Perspective from the United States." Paper presented at the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development, Centre for Educational Research and Innovation Conference on Early Childhood Education, Paris, October 1973.

Deffenbaugh, Sue A. Helping Your Child in Reading: Parent Education Program Minicourse. Hartford Public Schools, CT: Hartford University, West Hartford, CT, 1976. (ED 138 975)

Deloria, Dennis, and others. National Home Start Evaluation Interim Report. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc., and Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, October 1974. (ED 134 320)

Des Moines Area Community College. The Des Moines Family Learning Project. Ankeny, IA: Des Moines Public Schools, 1975. (ED 132 513)

Dixon, Brook, and others. Latin American Preschool. Rochester, MI: Oakland University, School of Education, 1974. (ED 105 963)

Dixon, Margaret A., and Nellie R. Duncan. Facilitating the Adjustment to and Participation in the Life of the School and Community by Newly Arrived Puerto Rican Pupils and Their Parents. Maxi I Report. Ed.D. Dissertation, Nour University, September 1974. (ED 113 400)

Dobson, Russell, and Judith Shelton Dobson. Parental and Community Involvement in Education and Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, DHEW, February 1975. (ED 100 833)

Dreikurs, R. and Soltz, U. Children: The Challenge. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1964.

East, Barbara. Early Childhood Creative Library Interim Report. Elkin, NC: Northwestern Regional Library, and Walnut Cove, NC: Yadkin Valley Economic Development District, Inc., 1975. (ED 124 206)

Ellis, Albert. Reason and Emotion in Psychotheraphy. New York: Lyle Stuart, 1970.

Ellis, Ronald S. Parent Orientation Program. Brooklyn, NY: New York City Board of Education, Office of Educational Evaluation, June 1976. (ED 142 633)

Ellis, Ronald S. Student-Parent Activities Center, June 1976. Brooklyn, NY: New York City Board of Education, Office of Educational Evaluation, June 1976. (ED 141 487)

Fallon, Berlie J. (ed.) 40 Innovative Programs in Early Childhood Education. CA: Fearon Publishers, 1973.

Fantini, Mario D. "Community Participation: Many Faces, Many Directions," Educational Leadership, 29, 8: 770-781, 1972.

Fauntleroy, James. (ed.) Federal Education Program Guide, Fifth Edition. Washington, D.C.: Capitol Publications, 1977/78.

Fowler, William, and Amy Swenson. "The Influence of Early Stimulation on Language Development." Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Denver, CO, April 12, 1975. (ED 115 363)

Frazier, Fred, and Wiliam A. Matthews. "Parent Education: A Comparison of Adlerian and Behavioral Approaches," Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 10, 1: 31-38, October 1975.

Friesen, John. "Family Counselling: A New Frontier for School Counsellors," Canadian Counselor, 10, 4: 180-184.

Gabinet, Laille. The Parenting Program for the Prevention of Child Abuse. Cleveland, OH: Cleveland Metropolitan General Hospital. (ED 132 778)

Gaines, Debby (comp.) and others. Educational Technology for the Severely Handicapped: A Comprehensive Bibliography. Topeka, KS: Kansas Neurological Institute, January 1975. (ED 108 416)

George Peabody College for Teachers Demonstration and Research Center for Early Childhood. Final Report to the Office of Economic Opportunity. Nashville, TN: George Peabody College for Teachers, DARCEE, December 1970. (ED 133 064)

Gilliam, Giles, and Jim Brown. "Parent Training," Health Education, 6, 5: 11-12, September-October 1975.

Ginott, H.G. Between Parent and Child. New York: Macmillan, 1965.

Glasser, W. Schools Without Failure. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

Goodman, Barry, and Norman Goodman. "Effects of Parent Orientation Meetings on Parent-Child Communication About Sexuality and Family Life," Family Coordinator, 25, 3: 285-290, July 1976.

Goodsen, Barbara, and Robert Hess. Parents as Teachers of Young Children: An Evaluative Review of Some Contemporary Concepts and Programs. Washington, D.C.: DHEW/OE, May 1975/revised August 1977.

Goodson, B. D., and R. D. Hess. The Effects of Parent Training Programs on Child Performance and Parent Behavior. Stanford University, 1976.

Gordon, I. J. Reaching the Child Through Parent Education: The Florida Approach. Gainesville: Institute for the Development of Human Resources, College of Education, University of Florida, 1969. (ED 057 880)

Gordon, Ira. Parent Involvement in Compensatory Education. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1970.

Gordon, Ira. Parent Education and Parent Involvement: Retrospect and Prospects. Gainesville: Institute for Development of Human Resources, College of Education, University of Florida, 1977.

Gordon, Ira. "What Does Research Say About the Effects of Parent Involvement on Schooling?" Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for Supervisors in Curriculum Development, San Francisco, March 1978.

Gordon, T. Parent Effectiveness Training: The "No Lose" Method for Raising Responsible Children. New York: Wyden, 1970.

Gray, S., P. Levenstein, and D. Weikart. "Symposium on Parent-Centered Education," Childhood Education, 48, 3: 126-137, December 1971. (ED 080 048)

Greenfield, Carol Sue. "Stimulating Parent Involvement in Remedial Reading Programs: Strategies and Techniques." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Reading Association, Miami Beach, FL, May 2-6, 1977. (ED 140 245)

Greenwood, G. E., and others. "A Study of Changes in Parents Employed as Paraprofessionals in a Home Intervention Follow Through Program." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL, April 1974. (ED 089 872)

Hahn, Joyce, and Virginia Dunstan. "The Child's Whole World: A Bilingual Preschool That Includes Parent Training in the Home," Young Children, 30, 4: 281-288, May 1975.

Hamm, Phillip M., Jr., and David A. Lyman. Training Parents in Child Management Skills with the School as the Agent of Instruction. Lincoln, NB: Lincoln Public Schools, 1973. (ED 096 572)

Harris, T. A. I'm OK--You're OK. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

Heberle, Jeanne. "Learning Resources Center: Increasing Parent Competence." Louisville, KY: Louisville and Jefferson County Community Coordinated Child Care, February 1977. (ED 140 942)

Hess, Robert D. et al. "Intervention in Family Life", In Critical Issues in Research Related to Disadvantaged Children. Grotberg, E. (ed.) Education Testing Service, Princton, NJ, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, DC, 1969.

Hess, R. D. "Parental Behavior and Children's School Achievement. Implications for Head Start." In E. Grotberg (ed.), Critical Issues in Research Related to Disadvantaged Children. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, 1969. (ED 034 088)

Hess, R. D., and others. "Parent Involvement in Early Education." In Edith Grotberg (ed.), Day Care: Resources for Decisions. Washington, D.C.: OEO, Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, June 1971. (ED 050 307)

Hess, Robert D. "Effectiveness of Home-Based Early Education Programs." Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 84th, Washington, D.C., September 1976. (ED 133 048)

Hillman, Bill W., and Ted Perry. "The Parent-Teacher Education Center: Evaluation of a Program for Improving Family Reactions," Journal of Family Counseling, 3, 1: 11-15, 1975.

Jefferson County Public Schools. A Parent Education and Preschool Program with Added Dimensions. Lakewood, CO: Jefferson County Public Schools, 1975. (ED 122 954)

John, Thomas. Lenox Early Childhood Outreach Program for Parents: An Evaluation Study. Final Report. Washington, D.C.: DHEW/OE, July 1975. (ED 131 920)

Johnson, C. A., and R. C. Katz. "Using Parents as Change Agents for Their Children: A Review," Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 14, 181-200, 1973.

Johnson, Dale L., and others. Houston Parent-Child Development Center. Final Report. Houston: Houston University, Department of Psychology, 1976. (ED 135 459)

Johnson, Vicki M., and O. K. O'Fallon. Clinch-Powell Education Cooperative Early Childhood Education Program Evaluation Report. Knoxville, TN: Bureau of Educational Research and Service, Tennessee University, 1975. (ED 118 259)

Journal of Research and Development in Education: Parental Involvement. Winter, 1975.

Kramer, Jerald N. "Family Counseling as a Key to Successful Alternative School Programs for Alienated Youth," School Counselor, 24, 3: 194-196.

Kessen, William, and others. Variations in Home-Based Infant Education: Language, Play and Social Development. Final Report. New Haven, CT: Yale University, August 1975.

Kleinman, Harriet M. Effects of a Mother-Infant Program on Positive Feelings of New Mothers: A Pilot Investigation. Northridge, CA: California State University, June 1977. (ED 140 949)

Knight, Martha F., and others. 1972-73 Report of the Essential Early Education Project. Burlington, VT: Vermont University, College of Education, 1973. (ED 095 681)

Lamb, Jackie, and Wesley A. Lamb. Parent Education and Elementary Counseling. 1975. (ED 109 587)

Lane, Mary B. Education for Parenting. Urbana, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Early Childhood Education, 1974. (ED 103 093)

Lazar, Irving and others. A National Survey of the Parent-Child Center Program. Los Angeles, CA: Kirschner Associates, Inc., 1970. (ED 048 933)

Lazar, Irving, et al. "The Persistence of Preschool Effects: A Long-Term Follow-up of Fourteen Infants and Preschool Experiments." Ithaca, NY: Cornell University, New York State College of Human Ecology, Community Service Laboratory, 1977.

Lazar, J., and J. Chapman. A Review of the Present Status and Future Research Needs of Programs to Develop Parenting Skills. Washington: Social Research Group, George Washington University, 1972. (ED 020 318)

Ledet, Louise, and Melba Rabinowitz. "Working with Parents on the Importance of Curiosity and Exploration in an Infant's Development," Young Children, 30, 3: 179-183, 1975.

Levitt, Edith, and Sairley Cohen. Parents as Teachers: A Rationale for Involving Parents in the Education of Their Young Handicapped Children. New York: City University of New York, Hunter College, Special Education Development Center, 1974. (ED 099 141)

Lichtman, Ethel. Educating Parents About Education: A Review of Some Issues, Methods, and Sources of Information. Stanford University, California Stanford Center for Research and Development in Training, December 1974. (ED 129 710)

Lieber, Madeleine. "Mother-Toddler Groups as a New Source for Parent Education." Master's Thesis, California State University, May 1975. (ED 124 294)

Lillie, David L., and Pascal L. Trohanis. Teaching Parents to Teach. New York: Walker and Co., 1976.

Lincoln, Robert D. "Reading to Young Children," Children Today, 3, 3: 28-30, 1974.

Los Angeles Unified School District. "Building Communication Skills: Home-School-Community." July 1, 1970 to June 30, 1972. Florence-Firestone Project. Final Report. Los Angeles: Los Angeles Unified School District, California, 1972. (ED 075 689)

Love, John M., and others. National Home Start Evaluation: Final Report, Findings and Implications. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc., and Ypsilanti, MI: High Scope Education Research Foundation, 1976. (ED 134 314)

McConnell, Beverly. Training Migrant Paraprofessionals in Bilingual Mini Head Start. Final Evaluation, 1974-75 Program Year. Progress Report No. 7. Ephrata, WA: Washington State Intermediate School District 104, September 1975. (ED 114 222)

Meier, John H., and others. An Education System for High-Risk Infants: A Preventive Approach to Developmental and Learning Disabilities. Denver, CO: Colorado University, Denver Medical Center, March 1970. (ED 043 379)

Mecklenburg County. Final Evaluation of the Three-Year Project of the Mecklenburg County Department of Social Services Agency Operated Child Development-Day Care Program. Charlotte, NC: Mecklenburg County Department of Social Services, May 1972. (ED 107 383)

Midco Educational Association, Inc. Perspectives on Parent Participation in Project Head Start: An Analysis and Critique. Denver, CO: Midco Educational Association, Inc., October 1972. (ED 080 217)

Morris, Ann G. "How to Set Up an Educational Intervention Program in a Pediatric Clinic Playroom." New York: Mount Sinai School of Medicine, 1976. (ED 133 078)

Northeast Area Learning Resource Center. Guide to Resources for Parents of the Handicapped Child. Highstown, NJ: Northeast Area Learning Resource Center, 1975a. (ED 131 653)

Northeast Area Learning Resource Center. Guide to Resources for Severely/Profoundly Handicapped. Hightstown, NJ: Northeast Area Learning Resource Center, 1975b. (ED 131 654)

O'Dell, S. "Training Parents in Behavior Modification: A Review," Psychological Bulletin, 81: 418-433, 1974.

Osinski, Franklin W. W., and others. Toward Gog and Magog or?: A Critical Review of the Literature of Adult Group Discussion. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University, New York Publications Program in Continuing Education, August 1972. (ED 066 652)

Pellegino, J. "Parent Participation," Education Canada, 13: 4-9, 1973.

Perkins School for the Blind. Additions to Bibliography: Education of Deaf-Blind, Fall 1972-June 1974. Watertown, MA: Perkins School for the Blind, 1974. (ED 098 766)

Pink, William. "Citizen Participation in Educational Governance: A Concept Paper." Paper presented for the School Relations Unit of the Educational Equity Division, National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C. 1977

Pomfret, A. "Involving Parents in Schools: Toward Developing A Social Interaction Technology," Interchange, 3: 114-130, 1972.

Reisinger, James J., and John P. Ora. "Parents as Change Agents for Their Children: A Review," Journal of Community Psychology, 4: 103-123, 1976.

Rich, Dorthy, and Cynthia Jones. A Family Affair: Education. Washington, D.C.: The Home and School Institute, 1977.

Robin, Fay. Education in Action, School Year 1975-76. New York: New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY Office of Educational Evaluation, 1976. (ED 141 480)

Rosenberg, Max. "Community Relations-Approaches Educators Use," The Education Digest, 42-43, January 1974.

Rothenberg, Donna. Early Childhood Education: Status, Trends, and Issues Related to Electronic Delivery. St. Louis, MO: Washington University, Program on Application of Communication Satellites to Educational Development, May 1973.

Scales, Peter, and Kathleen Everly. "A Community Sex Education Program for Parents," Family Coordinator, 26, 1: 37-43, January 1977.

Schaefer, Earl S. "Parents as Educators: Evidence from Cross-Sectional, Longitudinal and Intervention Research," Young Children, 27, 4: 227-239, April 1972.

Schere, Richard, and others. Parents and Siblings of the Handicapped: A Selected Bibliography. March 1977. (ED 142 011)

Scheinfeld, Daniel R. "On Developing Developmental Families." In Edith Grotberg (ed.), Critical Issues in Research Related to Disadvantaged Children. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, 1969. (ED 034 088)

Schiefelbusch, R. L. Juniper Gardens Parent Cooperative Preschool, Final Report. Lawrence, KS: Kansas University, Bureau of Child Research, 1970. (ED 133 067)

Schlossman, Steven. "Before Home Start: Notes Toward a History of Parent Education in America, 1897-1929," Harvard Educational Review, 46, 3: 436-467, August 1976.

Schrock, John H. Parent Assisted Learning Strategies: The Development of an Early Intervention Program for Parents and Their Infants. (ED 121 426)

Schwartz, Lester J. Parent Resource and Tutorial Center, School Year 1975-1976. New York: New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY, Office of Educational Evaluation, 1976. (ED 142 642)

Scriven, M. "Goal-Free Evaluation." in House, E. (ed), School Evaluation. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1973.

Sheldon, Judith. An Analysis of a Family Involvement-Communication System in a Title I Elementary School. Final Report. 1973. (ED 082 091)

Shure, Myrna B., and George Spivack. Training Mothers to Help Their Children Solve Real-Life Problems. Philadelphia, PA: Hahnemann Community Mental Health Center, April 1975. (ED 114 166)

Siperstein, Gary N. Help Neighborhood Center Program, School Year 1975-1976. New York: New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY Office of Educational Evaluation, 1976. (ED 142 639)

Slaughter, Helen B. "Effect of Parent Involvement in an Early Intervention Program Upon Environmental Process Variables Related to Achievement." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C., March 30-April 3, 1975. (ED 107 373)

Sonquist, Hanne, and others. A Model for Low-Income and Chicano Parent Education. Final Report. Santa Barbara, CA: Santa Barbara Family Care Center, CA, 1975. (ED 113 063)

South Umpqua School District. South Douglas County Early Childhood Education Project. First Year Evaluation Report, July 1, 1971 to June 30, 1972. Myrtle Creek, OR: South Umpqua School District, 1972. (ED 072 848)

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Together is Best: Families and Schools. Findings of the Parent Education Demonstration Project in Region IV. Education Improvement Program. Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, August 1976.

Sprung, Barbara. "The Self-Image of the Working Mother and Her Child," Day Care and Early Education, 4, 2: 11-13, 42, 1976.

Stanford Research Institute, Menlo Park, CA. Parent Involvement in Compensatory Education Programs. Research memorandum, prepared for OE (DHEW), Washington, D.C., Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation, August 1973. (ED 088 588)

Stendler, Celia B. "Sixty Years of Child Training Practices." Journal of Pediatrics, 26: 122-134, 1950.

Stevens, Joseph H., Jr. "Current Directions in the Study of Parental Facilitation of Children's Cognitive Development," Educational Horizons, 50, 2: 62-66, Winter 1971-72.

Stevens, Joseph. "The Home Learning Project: A Group Consultation Model of Parent Education," Child Care Quarterly, 3, 4: 246-254, 1974.

Sunley, Robert. "Early Nineteenth Century American Literature on Child-Rearing," Chapter 9 in Mead, Margaret and Wolfenstein, Martha (eds.). Childhood in Contemporary Cultures. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Texas Department of Community Affairs. The Texas Front with the Nation's Struggle Against Poverty. 1975-76 Annual Report of the Economic Opportunity Division, Texas Department of Community Affairs.

Texas Education Agency. 49th Biennial Report. Austin, TX: The Texas Education Agency, 1974-76.

Tucker, Eugene. "The Follow Through Planned Variation Experiment: What is the Pay-Off?" Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY, April 5, 1977. (ED 141 449)

U.S. Department of HEW. Head Start Services to Handicapped Children. Third Annual Report of the DHEW to the Congress of the U.S. on Services Provided to Handicapped Children in Project Head Start. Washington, D.C.: DHEW, OHD/OCD, June 1975.

United States Office of Education. Educational Programs That Work. National Diffusion Network, Far West Educational Laboratory, 1976. (ED 130 456)

Utah State University. Effectiveness of Parents as a Treatment Resource in Rural Areas. Final Report, November 1976. Logan, UT: Uta State University, Exceptional Child Center, November 1976.

Walton, Mildred. Mothers as Key Educators of Their Preschool Children. Atlanta, GA: Harwell Road Elementary, September 1973. (ED 096 020)

Wandersman, Lois Pall, and Abraham Wandersman. Facilitating Growth for All the Family in the Adjustment to a Newborn. Bethesda, MD: Bureau of Health Professions Education and Manpower Training, DHEW, October 1976. (ED 138 373)

Weikart, David P. "Parent Involvement: Process and Results of the High/Scope Foundation's Projects." Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Denver, CO, April 13, 1975. (ED 113 041)

Walters, Nancy R. Parents: Key People to Assist in Occupational Decision Making (Project No. 1100). Final Report. Jefferson City, MO: Missouri State Department of Education, August 31, 1974. (ED 106 687)

White, Burton L., and others. Child-Rearing Practices and the Development of Competence. Final Report. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Graduate School of Education, December 1974.

Winch, R. The Modern Family. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc. 1971.

Wise, Jamis H. Parent Participation Reading Clinic--A Research Demonstration Project. Final Report. 1972. (ED 072 174)

Wolfenstein, Martha. "Trends in Infant Care." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 28: 120-130, 1953.

Wright, Charlene J., and others. A Videotape In-Home Study of the Social and Educational Teaching Styles of Mothers and Their Five-Year-Olds. 1975. (ED 110 163)

Wulf, Kathleen M., and Evelyn Bartenstein. An Attempt at Parent Education Through a Lecture-Discussion Series. 1975. (ED 140 959)

Yurchak, Mary Jane, and others. Infant-Toddler Curriculum of the Brookline Early Education Project. Brookline, MA: Brookline Public Schools, Masbo Cooperative Corp, Winchester, MA, November 1975. (ED 135 475)

APPENDIX A

Coding Sheet: School-Based Education
Coding Sheet: Non-School Based Education
Program Data Sheet

## CODING SHEET: SCHOOL-BASED EDUCATION

Date: _____

Coder: _____

Search Number: _____

Number Generated By Search: _____

Documents Relevant & Coded: _____

_____

Specific Documents Relevant But Uncoded: _____

_____

Specific Documents Relevant But Difficult To Code: _____

_____

_____

Specific Documents Not Relevant: 1) (DNA): _____

_____

2)(Prior to 1970): _____

1. Code only for U.S.
2. Code those abstracts which seem to be concerned with several topics under all the appropriate codes.
3. Code in small print documents which have as a small component the content quality being coded.
4. Circle document numbers which have a very large or important component of the content being coded.
5. If a single program is described and formally evaluated it is coded only in the two program categories. Do not code in "Research Study" category; use "Research Study" category for other types of studies.
6. Code documents which review and formally evaluate a number of programs in both "Review of Programs" category and "Research Study" category.
7. When a document is coded in the "Special Variable" section it must also be coded in the "Document–Parent Role" section.
8. Documents coded in the "Special Cases" section most likely will be coded in the "Document–Parent Role" section or "Document–Community Role" section.
9. Code documents with content about day-care and preschool on the "School-Base" form, unless the content is clearly community-based, and has nothing to do with school/academic preparation.

| Content → / Document Type ↓ | PARENT/FAMILY ROLE/INTERACTION WITH SCHOOL-BASED EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM | | | | | | | SPECIAL VARIABLES | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | PARENT EDUCATION (Parents as Learners) | | | PARENTS AS WORKERS IN SCHOOL PAW | PARENTS AS CONSULTANTS (obtaining parent opinions, reactions, concerns) | PARENTS AS DECISION-MAKERS | PARENT INCLUSION ("How" not specified) | EDUCATOR INVOLVED EI | SPECIAL POPULATIONS KIDS | SPECIAL POPULATIONS POP PARENTS |
| | P.E. for better Parenting PEP | P.E. for teaching own kids PET | P.E. in General (Type not specified) PEG | Teacher, Para Professional, Volunteer, Other | PAC | PADM | PI | Administrator, Care Giver, School Counselor, Sp. Ed. Teacher, Para Professional, School Social Workers, Teacher, Other | Handicapped, Migrant, Black & Hispanic, Other | Working Mom, Low Income, Single Parent, Other |
| Description of Single Program | | | | | | | | | | |
| Evaluation of Single Program | | | | | | | | | | |
| Review of (71) Programs | | | | | | | | | | |
| Research Study | | | | | | | | | | |
| Literature Summary, Review, Survey of 71 Study | | | | | | | | | | |
| Conceptual "Models for..." | | | | | | | | | | |
| Opinion, Policy Statement, Recommendation | | | | | | | | | | |
| "How To" Guide Strategy, Directions for... | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bibliography | | | | | | | | | | |
| Resource List | | | | | | | | | | |

## CODING SHEET: NON-SCHOOL BASED EDUCATION

Date: _____

Coder: _____

Search Number: _____

Number Generated By Search: _____

Documents Relevant & Coded: _____

_____

Specific Documents Relevant But Uncoded: _____

_____

Specific Documents Relevant But Difficult To Code: _____

_____

_____

Specific Documents Not Relevant: 1) (DNA): _____

_____

2)(Prior to 1970): _____

1. Code only for U.S.
2. Code those abstracts which seem to be concerned with several topics under all the appropriate codes.
3. Code in small print documents which have as a small component the content quality being coded.
4. Circle document numbers which have a very large or important component of the content being coded.
5. If a single program is described and formally evaluated it is coded only in the two program categories. Do not code in "Research Study" category; use "Research Study" category for other types of studies.
6. Code documents which review and formally evaluate a number of programs in both "Review of Programs" category and "Research Study" category.
7. When a document is coded in the "Special Variable" section it must also be coded in the "Document–Parent Role" section.
8. Code documents about nutrition in "Physical Care" category (rather than "Home Management").
9. Code documents which have specific therapeutic content and or psychological counseling content in the "Psychological Care" category. Similar documents which do not contain content involving "therapy" or "counseling" (such as a parent-education group discussing child rearing or family interaction, led by another untrained parent) in the "Family Dynamics" or "Child Rearing/ Parenting" category.
10. Code documents about day care and preschool on the "School-Based" form, unless the content is *clearly* community-based and *clearly* has nothing to do with school/academic preparation.

## PARENT/FAMILY INTERACTION WITH NON-SCHOOL-BASED EDUCATION

Content →

| Document Type ↓ | PARENT EDUCATION (Parents as Learners) | | | PARENTS AS WORKERS IN COMMUNITY PAW | | | | | PARENTS AS CONSULTANTS (obtaining parent opinions, reactions, concerns) | PARENTS AS DECISION-MAKERS | PARENT INCLUSION ("How" not specified) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | P.E. for better Parenting PEP | P.E. for teaching own kids PET | P.E. in General (Type not specified) PEG | Teacher | Para-Professional | Volunteer | Other | | PAC | PADM | PI |
| Description of Single Program | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Evaluation of Single Program | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Review of (71) Programs | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Research Study | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Literature Summary, Review, Survey of 71 Study | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Conceptual "Models for..." | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Opinion, Policy Statement, Recommendation | | | | | | | | | | | |
| "How To" Guide Strategy, Directions for... | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bibliography | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Resource List | | | | | | | | | | | |

## SPECIAL VARIABLES

| EDUCATOR INVOLVED | | | | | | | | | | |

PROGRAM DATA SHEET

PROGRAM #_____

Source ED_____
PMIC_____
FACS_____

1. Program identification

   Program name

   Sponsor agency

   Geographical location

   Central facility address

   Name of director/coordinator

   Program/component budget

   Budget duration

   Source(s) of funding

2. Target population and participant characteristics

   Eligibility restrictions

   Children's age/grade range

   Ethnicity of participants

   Number of participants

   Recruitment/selection/assignment to program

      Parents

      Children

   Attrition/drop out rate

   Needs assessment activities performed

      Parent needs

      Children needs

      Program/agency needs

Program staff characteristics

   Total number of full-time equivalents (paid staff)

Type and number of staff

administrative

instructional

volunteer

Sex ethnicity and age of staff

Staff recruitment, selection and training

Type and intensity of training

Consultant availability

4. Program content and delivery modes.

Stated goals/objectives

for parents

for children

for staff/teacher/program

Program length/duration

Program intensity/volume in number of parent/hours

Specific program activities/components

what is the activity

who is trainer

specific objectives/goals for activity

frequency

average participation (number of parents)

average duration in hours

staff/participant ratio

location/setting

materials used

commercially available

program developed

General procedure and operation of program

5. Program-evaluation design and instruments.

Who has the role/function of evaluator

What are the evaluation questions/criteria/objectives

about parents

about children

about teachers/staff

about program

Evaluation design

Evaluation instruments used

standardized

program made

type of instrument

Use of program records

Disposition of evaluation date/report

5a. Evaluation findings/results.

6. Rationale/motivation for program.

7. Sociocultural context of program.

8. Needs perceived by parent education leaders/promoters.

APPENDIX B

Brief Descriptions of Parent Education Programs

1. THE MOTHER-CHILD PROGRAM (P. Levenstein)

The Mother-Child Home Program is a home-based preschool cognitive intervention program, first field tested in 1967. Still continuing today, it is a home-visit program for teaching low-income Black mothers more ways of interacting verbally with their child. Participation in the program begins when the target child is two years old. A maximum of 46 home visits for seven months during each year are made. The program's goal is to train parents, in their homes, in ways to build their children's verbal abilities. Levenstein conceptualized books and toys as verbal interaction stimuli materials. She chose about a dozen books and about a dozen toys with these properties, then sent toy demonstrators into the homes where these toys and books were left with the mother for use with the child.

The program was originally established in three New York low-income housing projects. Families were recruited by mailing explanatory letters followed by home visits by the program supervisor. The only eligibility requirements were that the families qualified for low income housing and that no member of the family had more than a high school education.

The toy demonstrators are trained paraprofessionals either middle class women volunteers or paid low-income women who were former participants in the program. ( Madden, J., Levenstein, P., Levenstein, A. Longitudinal IQ Outcomes of the Mother-Child Home Program, 1967-73. Verbal Interaction Project. FSA of Nassau County, 1974.)

2. HOUSTON PARENT-CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER

The Parent-Child Centers provide educational programs for children, parent activities to increase parent effectiveness, and comprehensive health care for families. This program was designed to provide better education experiences for Mexican American children. Families enter the program when the target child is one year old and they remain for two years. For a year, bilingual teachers trained in early childhood theory and practice make weekly home visits to the families in the experimental group. Mothers are helped to develop their own teaching skills, to use household materials for learning, to select and make toys, to understand more about child development. The home educator attempts to act as advisor rather than expert. The first year of home visits is supplemented with four workshops at the Center in order that the whole family can participate. In the second year of the program, the children are enrolled in a pre-school classroom in which the curriculum group sessions and each group, parent and child, meets four mornings a week for eight months. The parent training course consists of home management skills and micro-teaching with the child. Bilingual skills for both parents and children are stressed throughout both years.

The staff of the Houston Parent-Child Center seems to be totally professional in nature. Bilingual certified teachers work directly with the participants' mothers both in the Center and in the home.

The families are recruited from two low-income barrios through door to door visits by HDCDC staff. The requirements were that the family have a child under one year of age, an unemployed mother, and economic disadvantage. (Lelar, H., Johson, D., Kahn, A., and Brandt, L. Research Report of the Houston Parent-Child Development Center. 1974).

3. NEW ORLEANS PARENT-CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER

This center offers a program designed to change low-income, Black parents' attitudes and behavior towards their child in ways which encourage the child's development. Mothers participate in classes at the Center or in their homes, learning child development principles and child rearing practices which stimulate the child's competence. Two approaches were used in working with parent - center classes and individual home visits. In the center groups, mothers brought infants (two to twelve months) to the Center twice a week for three hour visits. Home Visit mothers received bi-weekly home visits of about an hour each. Educators were nonprofessionals trained as teachers to work with mothers and infants. The program emphasized the importance of teaching mothers more than specific techniques - it emphasized all aspects of the child's development - emotional, physical as well as cognitive. Different workbooks were developed for parent use with lessons on child development, tables for keeping records and day-by-day suggestions for interacting with infant/child.

The families in the program are low income and Black. The families live within the same area of New Orleans. Method of recruitment was not discussed. (Andrews, S., Rache, W., Blumenthal, J., Wiener, G. Summary of Research Findings of the New Orleans Parent-Child Development Center. 1974)

4. BIRMINGHAM PARENT-CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER

Begun in 1969-1970 to operate as a research center, the Birmingham program is designed to help Black and White volunteer low-income mothers learn both how to interact with their child so as to facilitate the child's development more effectively and to cope with other demands on them as adults so as to increase their probability of using the new interactions with their child. Families enter the program when their child is 4 months old and remain until the child is 3 years old. Mothers are assumed to teach their child and other children; children teach mothers; mothers teach other mothers.

Families in the program are primarily from housing projects in five low income neighborhoods in Birmingham. Recruiting is done by door to door canvassing by Center staff.

Professional teachers and paraprofessionals are utilized by this program. (Birmingham Parent-Child Development Center Progress Report, April 1974.)

5. THE DARCEE PROGRAMS, NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

DARCEE has experimented with programs designed to: 1) train mothers to work with the child in the home utilizing the vehicle of home visits; and 2) train mothers by means of a highly structured paraprofessional training program which involves parents directly in the classroom.

The original home visitor project, EARLY TRAINING PROJECT, of Gray and Klaus, began in 1961. It employed certified Black elementary school teachers, women in their 40's and respected members of the community, as home

visitors. They made weekly home visits to each mother and child in the program for nine months. The mothers all lived in the same housing project and were of similar socio-economic and educational levels. Each target child was also enrolled in a preschool program at the center. Mothers were assisted in planning educational activities for their child that capitalized on the daily routine in the home and made optimal use of mother's limited time. The home visitors also concentrated on helping the mothers to cope more effectively and efficiently with general household responsibilities while still finding time to work with the target child. The home visitor also attempted to keep parents informed about local opportunities in housing, adult education and employment. (Atyas, J. and Gray, S. Towards a Theoretical Rationale for a Home Visiting Program with Mothers. Preliminary Papers from DARCEE. 1973.)

The second study, Mother's Training Program (MTP) aimed at changing the nature and the quality of the mother-child interactions by furnishing the mother with skills and resources to stimulate the child. The mothers were paid for their direct involvement in DARCEE classroom activities and cooperative baby-sitting arrangements were made. In addition to training at the Center, a teacher met weekly with the mother at home to encourage her to use her newly acquired teaching skills.

This MTP study was to test for diffusion effects. The subjects, the younger siblings were divided into four groups: 1) children whose mothers were enrolled in MTP; 2) children whose mothers were involved in home visits only; 3) children whose mothers were not involved with DARCEE in any way; 4) a control group of children of the same socio-economic status, race and age and who were not exposed to intervention treatment.
(Gray, S. and Gilmer, Barbara. Intervention with Mothers and Young Children: A Study of Intrafamiliar effects. DARCEE Papers and Reports, Vol.4, No. 11 1970)

A third DARCEE study looked at the home visitor programs with emphasis on their cost effectiveness. Barbrack (1970) described the study in which the effects of variation in expense and professional training were examined. The experimental group served entirely by paraprofessional home visitors with a per child cost of $225 resulted in being the most effective in terms of the analyses of general intelligence, concept development and maternal teaching style.

Participants in the DARCEE-sponsored programs came from low-income areas and housing projects in the Appalachian area. Recruiting was done principally through the mail followed up with home visits to eligible mothers. Those who were interested were enrolled. In some cases Head Start families were used as the subject population. (Barbrack, C. The Effects of 3 Home Visitation Strategies upon Measures of Children's Academic and Maternal Teaching Behavior. DARCEE Papers and Reports, Vol.4, No.1. 1970).

6. MOTHERS TRAINING PROGRAM

Merle Karnes and her associates at the University of Illinois developed an experimental training program for low-income mothers to become tutors of their own children. The first part of the training for mothers of three and four year olds lasted for 12 weeks in 1968. The second part, for mothers of one and two year olds, operated over 15 months. The overall goal of the program was to work with disadvantaged children before school to increase their general and verbal intelligence to that they would be better learners in school, with higher motivation, attention and stronger work habits. Parents, through training, were to become teachers of their own children.

Once a week parents attended a group meeting for two hours. They did role playing, made educational toys, learned principles of good teaching. The staff members made semi-monthly home visits to observe each mother with her child. In the program with one and two year olds, more leadership responsibilities in the group meetings were taken over by the mothers themselves.

Recruitment was done through 1) recommendation by a school principal, 2) names drawn from the rolls of the Public Health and Welfare Department, and 3) canvassing of low-income neighborhoods by a MTP interviewer.

Professional teachers and home visitors were utilized.

(Karnes, M.B., Studley, W.N., Wright, W.R., and Hogins, A. An Approach for Working with Mothers of Disadvantaged Preschool Children. Merrill Palmer Quarterly. 1968.) (Karnes, M.B., Teska, J., Hogins, A. and Badger, E. Education. An Intervention at Home by Mothers of Disadvantaged Infants. Child Development, 1970.)

7. The Perry Preschool Project (The Cognitively Oriented Curriculum)

This project began in 1962 and continued until 1967.

The Perry Preschool Project offered a planned preschool program for three and four year old children, supplemented by 90 minute weekly home visits to the children and their mothers. The aim of the program was "to compensate for functional mental retardation found in disadvantaged children." The children selected were poor, classified as "educable mentally retarded," and Black. Names of participant families were obtained from census data, birth records, and community welfare agencies.

Children attended a preschool program for five days a week, half days. The curriculum was based on the Piaget sequential, cognitive development model. During the home visits, parent participation was encouraged, but not required. Mothers were not put in the role of most important teacher.

(Weikart, D. Development of Effective Preschool Programs: A Report on the Results of the High/Scope Ypsilanti Preschool Projects. 1973)

8. The Curriculum Demonstration Project (Ypsilanti)

In 1967, this project was begun to investigate the relative effectiveness of three curricula in early education programs: The Cognitively Oriented Curriculum, the Language Training Program and the Traditional Nursery School.

The Cognitively Oriented Curriculum was based on Piagetian theory. A broad base of direct experience activities is used to build children's reasoning skills and fundamental concepts.

The Language Training Program, developed by Bereiter and Englemann, involved direct, sequential teaching of language, arithmetic and reading skills, clearly defined goals in skill achievement.

The Traditional Nursery School or Unit-Based Curriculum offered a free, open environment for children with make-believe, doll corners, etc.

All three curricula were accompanied by 90 minute weekly home visits which fit into the same curricular style as the class program. All three groups of children attended half day classes during the week.

(Weikart, D. Ypsilanti Preschool Curriculum Demonstration Project 1968-71.)

9. The Infant Education Project (Ypsilanti)

This project begun in 1968 was aimed at increasing the development of low-income infant children by means of home visits to mother/child pairs.

The Infant Education Project focused on the home tutoring by the mother, lesson plans and educational goals set by the mothers, and the age of the children in the program was under one year upon entrance. The Home Visit treatments were weekly for 16 months.

The curriculum for the visits was based on Piagetian theory: early learning was seen as a change in the child's cognitive structures rather than the acquisition of any specific content. The sequential nature of child development was emphasized, with achievement in the sensory-motor period considered crucial to all later development.

Three different groups made up the project: the experimentals, the contrasts, the controls. The experimental group received weekly home visits of 60 to 90 minutes from a professionally trained staff. The home visitor was expected to function as a resource for the mother rather than as an expert telling her what to do.

The second group, the contrast, was originally designed to offer unstructured home visits to some families in contrast to the planned home visits of the experimental group. Volunteer college students were assigned to make the visits.

The third group, the control, was designed to be a no-treatment group with only periodic testing. This testing factor was apparently interpreted by some control group mothers as being a stimulating program and the group ended up functioning as a minimal treatment group.

Recruitment of families was done, first, on the basis of geographic location (within a selected target area) second, on the age of the child; and third on the family's score in a socioethnic scale. Most families were in the low to middle income range. Names of prospective families were obtained from census records, city birth records, and community resources. Staff teachers were used as interviewers and home visitors.

The home visitors were professional teachers and college students.

(Lambie, D., Bond, J., and Weikart, D. Final Report. Ypsilanti Infant Education Project. Infants, Mothers and Teaching: A Study of Infant Education and Home Visits. 1973)

10. SPECIAL KINDERGARTEN INTERVENTION PROGRAM (SKIP)

In the fall of 1967 the Ypsilanti Public Schools began a follow-up program for low-income kindergarten children. The target population was low-income children who had previously participated in a compensatory preschool. The program has two components - a special class for children and an intensive academic-oriented counseling program for the mothers.

Families were recruited from school rolls and selected on the basis of IQ scores (highest were selected). Professional parent workers made weekly home visits. (Final Report of the Supplementary Kindergarten Intervention Program, Cohort 2, Ypsilanti Public Schools, 1969.)

11. YPSILANTI EARLY EDUCATION PROGRAM

The Ypsilanti Early Education Program was a compensatory preschool program aimed at raising the school performance of low-income children. The mothers were offered the opportunity to participate in home sessions and group meetings aimed at improving child-rearing behavior.

The target population was low-income Black and White families.

Professional teachers were utilized as in school teachers of parents and home visitors. (Radin, N. Three Degrees of Maternal Involvement in a Preschool Program: Impact on Mothers and Children. Child Development, 1972.

12. EARLY CHILDHOOD STIMULATION THROUGH PARENT EDUCATION PROJECT

The ECSTPEP Project designed by Ira Gordon, as a home visitor program in rural Florida, was begun in 1966 to train low-income women as Parent Educators to enter the homes of other indigent women to teach them how to interact more with their infant. A Home Center was added in 1968 to offer backyard classes for small groups of children under the guidance of the mothers who had been trained.

Children entering the program ranged in age from 3 to 12 months. The distinctive nature of this program is that nonprofessional, neighborhood women were trained as Parent Educators (PE). Home Visits were made once weekly for a two year period. Mothers were instructed by the PE's in the how-to's of stimulating their babies. Exercises were specific and concrete. They were sequentially developed sensory-motor activities. There was no special added language training for the mothers; the PE's visited the homes to demonstrate a specific, previously planned activity, showed the mother how to do it, helped her understand its purpose, and reinforced mother and child in their learning efforts.

According to program design, it was the mothers who were the target group for the intervention. All of the work between PE and mother took place in the home.

Nine different treatment groups were formed over a period of two years.

The Home Learning (Backyard) Centers were added in the second year of the program. Two year olds who had been in the program since the age of 3 months attended the centers for one year for two two-hour periods each week. The Parent Educators continued to have weekly meetings with each mother/child pair.

The participant families were from an indigent population in rural and small town Florida. They were primarily Black. Mothers and children who satisfied program criteria were identified at birth by the staff of an area hospital. The criteria were 1) financial - indigent, 2) health - child was normal and single, 3) residential - lived within the target area.

(Gordon, I.J. The Florida Parent Education Early Intervention Projects. A Longitudinal Look. 1973.)

13. Parent-Child Course

This course of ten weeks, since 1969, part of the Far West Laboratory's program, was a parent training program aimed at families with three and four year old children. Parents meeting weekly for two hours in a classroom setting were given training in ways to interact with their child at

home, using toys and games, to stimulate the child's intellectual and attitudinal growth. The training efforts go entirely into the parents. The program did not intervene directly in the homes. The training sessions were divided into two parts: a discussion section on topics related to child development and others raised by the parents and the "learning episode" in which parents learn how to use the educational toy of the week,

Two kinds of data were collected in evaluating this course: parents' questionnaires and children's test scores on a Responsive Test developed by the program sponsors.

Recruitment of families was through publicity efforts in the community of East Palo Alto - low-income families; Berkeley - middle class families, and Salt Lake City - low and middle class families.

Professional teachers were utilized during each 10-week course.

(Rosenau, R., and Tuck, B. A Guide to Securing and Installing the Parent-Child Toy Lending Library. 1972.)

14. Structured Language Program

This was a ten week experimental program at Arizona State University designed to develop the expressive language patterns of two year old children and their mothers. The children attended a preschool with a specific language program two mornings a week, while their mothers attended intensive workshops on specific language techniques. There were three groups of mother/child pairs: Group I, the main experimental group, was the structured program for mothers and children; Group II offered a general counseling program for the

mothers unrelated to language learning; while the children were in a day care situation; Group III was the treatment control group. A-1 testing was done by means of video-tapes, pre and post treatment, of mothers interacting with their children.

Recruitment methods and personnel are comparable to the Parent-Child Course. (Mann, M. The Effects of a Preschool Language Program on Two Year Old Children and Their Mothers. 1970)

15. Parents are Teachers too

This course for parents lasted ten weeks and was designed to teach parents of four year olds to be change agents in their children's education. Parents attended workshops in order to develop and learn to use specific educational materials in home-based teaching. Since 1967, this program has been combined with Head Start projects around the country.

There were three groups: Structured Language Training, Developmental Language Training, and Placebo.

The structured language group presented mothers with a specific repertoire of skills to apply in teaching and with materials to be used in specific ways, such as sentence structure patterning.

The developmental language group presented mothers with specific materials and techniques for verbal interaction with their child.

The placebo group spent the same amount of time as the treatment groups in parent meetings, but the content was of the more traditional parent education effort. All three groups attended weekly two hour classes and received home visits if they missed a meeting.

Recruitment methods and personnel are the same as above two programs.

Boger, R., Knipers, J., et al. Parents Are Teachers Too: A Curriculum Module for Increasing Positive Parent-Child, Parent-Teacher, and Parent-School Interaction. 1973)

16. LEARNING TO LEARN PROGRAM (H. Sprigle)

The Learning to Learn Program in Jacksonville, Florida involved parents of four to six year olds by having them become knowledgeable about what was happening in the carefully planned structured preschool and first grade classrooms of the Learning to Learn Program. Parents participated in the program by learning about their child's curriculum, school behavior, teacher/child interactions, etc. Home activities were encouraged, but parents were not guided in home tasks. Parent attitudes and general willingness to support learning rather than specific teaching behavior were emphasized. Parents were invited to attend monthly group meetings led by the teachers. The main activity during these meetings was the presentation of videotapes of children and their teachers in action. Tapes and discussions of them were planned to focus parents' attention on how classroom behaviors, relationahips, and curriculum were related to children's learning. Tapes also offered parents the role model of the teacher who worked with children in a planned, organized, successful way. Parents were encouraged to assume a similar teaching style with their child.

The target families were recruited from Black communities in Jacksonville. Families were identified through public announcements and contacts with the school system, churches, welfare department, and pediatricians. All of the participant families were Black and low-income.

Professional school teachers were utilized in this program.
(Sprigle, H.A. The Learning to Learn Teacher Education Program. Learning to Learn School. 1974.)

17. HOME-ORIENTED PRESCHOOL EDUCATION PROJECT (HOPE)

Appalachia Educational Laboratory

HOPE serving rural, isolated Appalachian families since 1968, uses three approaches to reach their families.

1) Televised Instruction: All children in the program were asked to watch a daily half hour show, "Around the Bend," produced by AEL. This was a pre Sesame Street approach; parents were encouraged to watch with their child.

2) Home Visitation: A paraprofessional visitor came to the home to talk with child and parents, bringing to the home instructional materials and assignments coordinated with the TV program.

3) Mobile Classroom: Weekly visits were made by this traveling classroom to areas in which ten or fifteen children could then attend group activities together which complemented the home instruction and provided social experiences for the children.

Among the goals for this project was to gather information concerning the relative contributions of different components of the program to the effectiveness of the overall program in terms of children's gains.

Families were first identified through surveys of target territories. Those families who wanted to participate were enrolled in the program.

Professional mothers and home visitors

(Alford, R.W., and Hines, B.W. Demonstration of a Home Oriented Early Childhood Education Program. Final Report. AEL. 1972.)

18. UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII INTERVENTION PROGRAMS

In 1967-68 the University of Hawaii Center for Research and Childhood Education began developing curricular modules for preschool classes along with parent participation components. Curriculum modules were developed in language, quantitative concepts, motivation, music, and physical activities. Different types of parent participation components were also designed differing in degree and type of involvement.

Altogether three Hawaii programs were established. Hawaii Program I emphasized language and cognitive development of the child. Program II concentrates on degree and type of parent involvement in the education of the child. Program III used a three-pronged approach - language, mathematics, and motivation as a curriculum model for the children. The parent component concentrates on the mother's home behavior.

Children were selected for the programs through Head Start classes.

Professional school teachers staffed each program.
(Adkins, D.C., and O'Malley, J. Final Report on Continuation of Programmatic Research on Curricular Modules for Early Childhood Education and Parent Participation. University of Hawaii. 1971.)

19. SPANISH DAME BILINGUAL PROJECT

The Spanish Dame Bilingual Project began in 1969 and finished its pilot operation in June, 1974. In the program, women recruited from the target area were trained as paraprofessional home tutors to 1) teach groups of five children daily in concept formation and language development and 2) work individually with the mothers on teaching methods for stimulating their child's intellectual development. All contact between program staff and participants was in the home.

The project was targeted at low-income bilingual families whose primary language was Spanish. Families were selected from three target areas of the Alum Rock School District of San Jose, California; participant families were identified through school records, one-to-one visits by community liaisons, local newspaper publicity, and word of mouth.

Certified school teachers, and trained paraprofessional home teachers were utilized in this project. (Bilingual Education Project, Santa Clara, California. Final Report. 1972.)

20. A STRUCTURED LANGUAGE PROGRAM FOR TWO YEAR OLDS AND THEIR MOTHERS

The purpose of this 10-week program carried out at Arizona State University was to develop expressive language patterns of two year old children and their mothers. The children attended a preschool with a specific language program two mornings per week, while their mothers attended workshops on specific language techniques. All of the families were Black and low-income. They were selected on the basis of geographical residence (within one-mile radius of the facility) and on the recommendation of the school principal. (Rich, Dorthy and Jones, Cynthia. A Family Affair. The Home and School Institute, Washington, D.C. 1977.

21. HOME START

Home Start is a federally funded home-based demonstration program for low-income families with 3 to 5 year old children. It is an extension of the Head Start Program and was designed to enhance a mother's skills in dealing with her children and to provide comprehensive social-emotional, health and nutritional services. The stated goal of the National Home Start Demonstration Program in 1971 was to demonstrate "alternative ways of providing Head Start type services for young children in their homes." (National Home Start Evaluation: Final Report. Abt Associates, Inc. Cambridge, Mass. 1976.)

22. THE BROOKLINE, MASSACHUSETTS EARLY EDUCATION PROJECT

The Brookline, Massachusetts School System, aided with grants from several of the nation's leading foundations has since 1972 deliberately helped raise many of the infants born in the area, hoping to reap a crop of bright, eager learners when these children enter the first grade in a few years. In the process, the school system has launched an experiment that may revolutionize both the education of babies and their pediatric care.

The project is based on the assumption that a child's future intelligence is determined for the most part before the age of 3. Consequently, this means that parents, not teachers, perform the major task of educating their children. Therefore, BEEP stresses that intervention should begin in babies' homes, that parents should be taught to raise more competent children by a teacher-consultant home visitor, that the most critical learning period is between 8-18 months of age, and that pediatricians should seek out possible handicaps early through special tests.

By contract, BEEP works through the children's parents and provides a rare continuity from birth to the age of 5.

BEEP serves all of the families in the Brookline community, regardless of race and income. It recruited Black, Chinese and Spanish speaking families from nearby Boston. These minorities now make up 38% of the total population of the BEEP project; the experimental group contains 282 families. (Rich, Dorthy and Jones, Cynthia. A Family Affair. The Home and School Institute. Washington, D.C. 1977.)

23. EMERGENCY SCHOOL AID ACT

The Emergency School Aid Act provides funds in much the same way as ESEA. Funds from this act go primarily to non-school service organizations rather than to schools or school districts. These organizations use ESAA funds to develop supplementary programs for school children. They range from teaching parents skills to enable them to be better teachers of their own children to classes to teach home management skills to parents so they may better manage their resources. There are currently nineteen ESAA-funded programs in Texas. All have a parent education program component.
(Federal Education Program Guide - A Directory of Education Programs and Administrators. Fifth ed. 1977-78.)

24. PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN FOLLOW THROUGH PROGRAMS

Follow Through is the Federal Government's research, development and evaluation program designed to identify, develop and validate approaches to education of low-income children in the early elementary grades. Follow Through is the largest educational research and development program ever undertaken. Follow Through was initially established in order to sustain and build on gains made by children in Head Start and similar preschool programs. One of the most important aspects of Follow Through is its emphasis on the involvement of parents inside and outside the classroom. Much of the emphasis was on the models of parent as advisor, parent as para-professional employee. Some FT projects used the parent as tutor model. There are six FT projects currently in operation in Texas.
(49th Biennial Report. Texas Education Agency. 1974-76.)

25. HEAD START

Head Start is the federal government's comprehensive early childhood education program first established by the Office of Economic Opportunity in 1964 and presently run by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Community Services Act of 1974.

Head Start serves low-income preschool children and their parents through innovative child development programs that meet the needs of the entire family. Many of the programs provide for home instruction for both parents and children, emphasizing the parents' role as their children's prime education.

The programs provide medical, dental, and psychological services when needed, as well as nutritional, well-balanced meals for the children.

There are eighty Head Start programs in operation in Texas at this time.

(The Texas Front in the Nation's Struggle Against Poverty. 1975-76. Annual Report of the Economic Opportunity Division, Texas Department of Community Affairs.)

26. ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act and amendments provide federal funds for the improvement of education of children in public and non-public schools. Title I of this act provides funds to develop compensatory education programs for disadvantaged children. As a condition for receiving funds under Title I, schools must have a parent involvement component as part of their program. These are usually parent advisory councils which have varying degrees of participation. Title IV of the ESEA provides funds for the development of innovative programs. Some of these may be parent participation programs of different types ranging from advisory to parent education programs. (Biennial Report - Texas Education Agency. 1974-76.)

27. MODEL PRESCHOOL UNIT FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

University affiliated facility intended to serve children with a variety of handicaps, to train students, paraprofessionals from different disciplines and parents. Parent participation, an essential component, included parent-staff conferences monthly, parent-group meetings, direct teaching activity by parents in the classroom, and individual and group instruction--generally about 500-600 hours per quarter of parent involvement activities. Parents were taught to apply at home the principles and procedures of behavior modification used at school, which included individual assessment, systematic, ongoing observation and recording of behavior. Success was determined by individual-child progress, parental support and efforts to reach out to new parents, to obtain needed funding and new programs. (Hayden, Alice H. "A Center-Based Parent-Training Model." in Lillie, David L. and Trohams, Pascal L. (eds) Teaching Parents to Teach, pp. 89-105, 1976.)

28. EARLY CHILDHOOD - SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHER EDUCATION PREPARATION PROGRAM

University affiliated program designed to prepare preschool teachers to work with handicapped and normal children between the ages of birth to seven years. Parent groups met with a Master's-degree level "head" teacher three times per year to learn about child rearing practices that can be employed at home and had two individual parent/head-teacher conferences during the year. In addition, special education trainees presented self-contained learning modules on child rearing to parent groups in two-hour long weekly meetings. Parents were given 15-20 minute homework assignments to apply the module instruction at home. (Mann, Marlis E., Albertson, Kay. A Performance Based Early Childhood Special Education Teacher Preparation Program: Overview. Virginia University, Charlottesville, School of Education, 1974.)

29. NISONGER CENTER FOR MENTAL RETARDATION AND DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

The University affiliated program for twelve parents with children, ages 5 months to 19 years with various handicaps, was designed to provide continuity in the treatment of the child through family involvement. Parent group meetings had a basic lecture-demonstration format, followed by group discussion, covering the following topics: parent-child relationships, home rearing and tutoring, and problems related to handicapping conditions. Success of parent training was evaluated in terms of positive response of parents. (O'Connell, Christine Y. The Challenge of Parent Education. Exceptional Children, 41:8:554-6, 1975.)

30. PARENT EDUCATION PROGRAM (PEP)

Operating conjointly with a teacher instructional program (TIP), PEP instructed 125 parents in 1974-75 in three areas of self-development: available social services, academic skills, and homemaking skills, including child education and management. Thirty-two weekly sessions were held, about four hours each, at the project school or nearby church. Parents also had the option to train as a teacher aide conducted in two-hour session per week for 20 weeks plus a practicum. Participant expressed satisfaction with the program was corroborated by instructor observation and instructor-made tests. (Bessant, Helen P. (ed.). A Final Report, 1969-75. Norfolk State College Education Professions Development Act. Project, 1975.)

31. A PARENT INVOLVEMENT MODEL FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN AND THEIR PARENTS

On the campus at Memphis State University, the program provided career training for special education and physical education students, and information and support to families of the severely disabled. While 118 handicapped and 66 normal siblings attended a recreation program, 168 parents attended large group sessions for lecture-demonstration about issues related to rearing a handicapped child, including behavior management. Parent small-group counseling/therapy sessions, led by a professional group counselor and assisted by vocational rehabilitation counseling students were held to promote mutual support, understanding, and positive attitudes toward own parenting skills. Near perfect attendance and a positive evaluation response attested to program success. (Flint, Wallace; DeLoach, Charlene. A Parent Involvement Program Model for Handicapped Children and Their Parents. Exceptional Children, 41;8; 556-7, May 1975.

32. PROGRAM FOR PARENT-INVOLVEMENT IN SHORT TERM PRESCHOOL PSYCHIATRIC CENTER

The University-affiliated staff training program focused on parents as principle educator and therapist for the learning disabled or emotionally disturbed preschooler. Over the usual three to six-month treatment period, parent discussion groups provided information about child development and behavior, including training behavior management. Family demonstration therapies for at least twelve weekly one-hour observations provided modeling by an educational therapist in behavior modification techniques. Individual counseling conferences were held regularly for support, mutual information exchange, and for the development of realistic expectations. The staff rates parent participation level in a formal review at least twice per year, and continuous records are kept on parent involvement activities. (Jones, Earle F. Parents as Staff Partners: A Program for Parent Involvement in A Short Term Preschool Psychiatric Center. Vol. III, No.1, The Staff Training Prototype Series, Texas University-Austin, Department of Special Education, 1973.)

33. MAGNOLIA PRESCHOOL PROGRAM

Located in a public school building, the program is designed to train regular classroom teachers to work with handicapped children, provide instruction and services to 30 five-year-old handicapped subjects in rural Arkansas, in preparation for regular classroom. The parent-education component, though not formally structured, encouraged involvement. Opportunities were provided for individual discussion with the social worker, private parent-teacher conferences, parent group meetings to explain the program and pupil progress, and the encouragement of school visits and volunteer classroom participation. Parent response to the program was highly favorable. (Warner, Donna, et.al. Exemplary Programs for the Handicapped. Vol. III, Early Childhood Education Case Studies, ABT Associates, Inc., Cambridge, Mass., 1973.)

34. MILWAUKEE PROJECT

A university-based intervention study in a poor inner-city area, the project was designed to prevent the development of familial retardation. The parent education component focused mainly on maternal vocational rehabilitation, but touched upon training in child rearing skills. The program intended to expand the later after the resolution of primary, especially employment-related, concerns. (Garber, Howard, Herber, Rick. The Milwaukee Project: Early Intervention As A Technique to Prevent Mental Retardation. Conn. University, Storrs, National Leadership Institute--Teacher Education/Early Childhood, Wisconsin University, Madison, Regional Rehabilitation Research and Training Center in Mental Retardation, 1973.)

35. CENTER FOR COMMUNITY ADJUSTMENT

This program for 77 multiply handicapped fourteen to twenty-one-year-olds had an optional parent involvement component. Those parents who did participate were trained at the school in behavior modification techniques: highly structured individualized program with behavior contingencies, rewards and punishment. Home carry-over/application of new skills was encouraged, with reported success. (Feldman, Martin A.; Byalick, Robert; Rosedale, Marion Preston. "Parent Involvement Programs--Growing Trend in Special Education." Exceptional Children, 41;9;551-54, 1975.

36. CENTRAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

A realistic home setting was used in hourly sessions with teachers of the deaf. Parents were given information about hearing disorders and about dealing with associated problems at home through instruction in language behavior shaping. Parent group learning sessions were also conducted monthly. (Simmons-Martin, Audrey. "Facilitating Positive Parent-Child Interactions," in Lillie, David (ed) et.al. Teaching Parents To Teach, A Guide for Working with The Special Child, TADS, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1976.)

37. PRESCHOOL PROJECT FOR DISADVANTAGED HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

In this study, ten inner-city, low-income, familially retarded preschoolers were given intensive, early intervention through ten months of parent training. Mothers were taught in a church basement in principles of early education (child rearing and home teaching) based on behavior modification techniques. Regular opportunities were also provided for group and individual counseling. Children progressed significantly. (Nellans, Teresa A., et.al. Maternal Participation in A Preschool Project for Disadvantaged Handicapped Children. Training School Bulletin: 68:4: 207-11, 1972.)

38. PARENT GROUP FOR GIFTED PRESCHOOLERS

Ten self-selected families with concerns related to the education of their bright, three to six-year-old preschool child were formed into a group for joint instruction. They were taught about the range of normal cognitive development and fostering creativity, and given opportunities to share concerns and confer with school professionals. The examination of attitudes, expectations, and methods of relating to own child was promoted. (Dwinell, Patricia L. Parent Education for Gifted Preschoolers. Paper presented at the Annual International Convention, The Council for Exceptional Children (55th, Atlanta, Georgia, April 11-15, 1977.)

39. PRE-SCHOOLER'S WORKSHOP

An individualized approach for the parents, with mutual parent-staff selection among the alternatives for parent involvement, were conducted in addition to the development of an individual prescriptive teaching method for each child. Traditional child-focused counseling services by the social worker, with psychiatric consultation, were available: group therapy focused on feelings; a content-oriented instruction group (1½ hours with ten parents) coordinated by social worker, teacher, and language therapist focused on

chosen informational topics. Individual instruction in behavior modification, home study, staff observation, teacher-parent conferences, and participation as a classroom aide were also available participation modalities. (Bloch, Judith. Developing Early Intervention Programs for Emotionally Handicapped Children. Preschooler's Workshop, Garden City, N.Y., 10p. Reprint of paper presented at Special Studies Institute (Hauppauge, N.Y., April 1-3, 1974.)

40. EXCEPTIONAL CHILD RESEARCH PROGRAM

In this university-affiliated program, parents were instructed in techniques of behavior modification for home use with the individual child: skill selections, analysis and break-down into sequential tasks; behavior observation and graphing of baseline data; procedures for carrying out and monitoring behavior shaping. Liaison and communication between parent and teacher were continuous, with periodic conferences and checks. Parents could also be trained as volunteer classroom aides. Success was evaluated in terms of the overall parent participation, the number of prescriptive treatments each parent conducted, or progress of target children, monitored individually. (Fredricks, H.D.B., Baldwin, Victor L, Grove, David. "A Home-Center Based Parent-Training Mode" in Teaching Parents to Teach. David L. Lillie, ed., New York: Walker and Co.1976. pp. 107-29.)

41. PRECISE EARLY EDUCATION OF CHILDREN WITH HANDICAPS (PEECH)

This program for mentally retarded preschoolers, each with one other handicap, included a structured classroom program individualized for each child, staff training, and active family involvement as a major component. At the center, a structured lesson approach with specific and limited objectives was used by the teacher to teach parents. A home visitor discussed with the family how they could extend the learning situation to the home, observed parents teaching, and gave feedback and support. Parents were also engaged in other ways: weekly group meetings, use of toy lending library, classroom observations, and individual discussions, all intended to develop home teaching skills and to lend support to other parents and the program. (Karnes, Merle. Staff Training in a University Setting (Emphasis on Parent Training). Vol. II, No. 5, Texas University, Austin. Dept. of Special Education, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE) Washington, D.C. 1971.)

42. THERAPEUTIC PRESCHOOL

This university-affiliated program was established as an alternative to individual psychotherapy for emotionally disturbed preschool children. The teacher acted as a model for demonstrating behavior modification techniques with the children in mandatory weekly observation sessions. The social worker served as a liaison for the parent with the school and community, helped arrange needed services, and helped train parents in home use of behavior modification techniques. Expanded parent involvement was planned. ( Woodside, Rosalie V. The Therapeutic Preschool: A Service, Research and Demonstration Project. Paper presented at the International Federation of Learning Disabilities. 2nd International Scientific Conference, Brussels, Belgium, Jan. 3-7, 1975)

43. SEVERE PERSONAL ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

The goal of this university medical center program was to teach parents of severely troubled school-aged children to become effective and independent behavior managers. Procedures included individual work with parents, often in the home, bi-monthly parent meetings, and the development of individualized home management programs involving instruction in the use of planning sheets, observational and recording techniques, reinforcement procedures and the arrangement of optimal learning conditions. Case studies and reported satisfactions by parents constituted evaluation procedures. (Swenson, Carl R. Intervention Strategies and Procedures for Helping Parents of Severely Emotionally Disturbed Children in Home Settings. Paper presented at the Annual International Convention, The Council for Exceptional Children. 55th, Atlanta, Ga., April 11-15, 1977)

44. NON-CATEGORICAL PRESCHOOL MODEL

This program for preschool handicapped children was developed and staffed by graduate students in a university special education department based on handicap severity rather than category. A sequential, developmental curricular and behavioral management program was developed for each child. Parents were trained in behavior modification techniques, by observation and intensive instruction, were observed using these techniques in the classroom, given guidance and feedback, participated on equal professional footing in the classroom and at home. (Riley, Neil C. Etal, Singer, Reanne, Jackson, Judith. Non-Categorical Preschool Model: Teacher and Parent Training Manual. Preschool Unit. 1976); Bolen, Jacqueline et al. Non-Categorical Preschool Model Program. Presented to the Dept. of Special Education, University of Southern California. June 1973.)

45. PRESCHOOL AND EARLY EDUCATION PROJECT (PEEP)

This project operated in two schools, serving 53 mentally retarded preschool children with other handicapping problems. A home-use behavior modification booklet was distributed and explained, and some home assistance by a social worker, staff, or graduate students was available. Mainly, an understanding of the school environment was promoted, so parents could participate at school, with home-carryover of learning intended. (Bergstein, Patricia and Hailey, Linda. "The Preschool and Early Education Project. Starkville, Mississippi," in Warner, Donna. Exemplary Programs for the Handicapped. Vol. III. Early Childhood Education Case Studies. ABT Associates, Inc., Cambridge, Mass., 1973.)

46. CHAPEL HILL TRAINING/OUTREACH PROGRAM

This program utilized an individualized prescriptive approach for both parents and preschool developmentally handicapped children. Parental involvement which varied according to preferences and needs, included opportunities for parent-teacher conferences, home visits, parent group meetings, family workshops, and training in the prescriptive teaching model and in the development of technical skills, from a relatively structured behavioral approach. (Warner, Donna et. al. Exemplary Programs for the Handicapped. Vol. III. Early Childhood Education Case Studies. ABT Assoc., Inc. Cambridge, Mass., 1973.)

47. PARENT INVOLVEMENT MODEL AT THE PITTSBURGH HOME FOR CRIPPLED CHILDREN

The model was established to provide services to inner-city multiply handicapped preschool children through a 3-year, 3-component parent involvement program. Parent groups met 1 day per week, managed by a child development specialist. The technique of modelling (by special education professionals: speech therapist, physical therapist, occupational therapist, teacher) was used and parents were encouraged to participate at school and at home. Family home visits, every 2-3 weeks by a community liaison worker, provided families with information and assistance in obtaining needed handicapped-related services and coordination of center-home-community activities. An "educational and home prescription plan," an individualized, staff-parent curriculum design for developmental cognitive learning, and socialization was developed and implemented at school, and promoted for home-use. Monthly progress records were maintained, as were long-term, follow-up records after community placement. (Jordan, Byron Neal. Parent Involvement: A Necessity in Early Intervention. Paper presented at the Annual International Convention, The Council for Exceptional Children. 55th, Atlanta, Ga., April 11-15, 1977.)

48. MISSOURI PROGRAM FOR THE SEVERELY HANDICAPPED

The program served 600 multiply handicapped mentally retarded students, ages 5-21 years, in six schools. The parent training component operated in two phases: 1) 10 weekly sessions of about 2 hours duration focusing on teaching general techniques of behavior management, and explanation of materials, and provided opportunities for problem-solving, role-playing, and group sharing of concerns; and 2) 8 weekly sessions of continuation training, augmented by individual conferences and home visits. Parental written program evaluations were highly positive. (Berkman, Gloria. Training Parents as Members of the Educational Team. Paper presented at the Annual International Convention, The Council for Exceptional Children. 54th, Chicago, Ill., April 4-9, 1976.)

49. RUTLAND CENTER

A center for children with severe emotional or developmental problems, housing educational and mental health professionals cooperatively, provided varying participation modalities according to parental needs, preferences, and staff assessments. "Modelling" by a lead teacher was the primary instructional method. A "monitor" acted as parent-teacher liaison and helped parents learn developmental therapy techniques and plan home management routines. Subjective evaluations were continuously maintained on parent progress by the maintenance of detailed frequency counts and recorded observations. (Platt, Judith. "The Rutland Center. Athens, Georgia" in Warner, Donna, et. al. Exemplary Programs for the Handicapped. Vol. III. Cambridge, Mass., 1973.)

50. UNISTAPS PROJECT

UNISTAPS' primary focus was the involvement of family in the education of the young, hearing-impaired child through counseling, guidance, and education. Participation activities, based on individual parental needs, were selected from nine basic choices, such as weekly learning sessions, group, lecture-discussion training, agency visits, and observation. A social worker assisted parents throughout the program. A tutor/counselor coordinated group meetings led by staff and outside consultants, and conducted in-center training in schoolroom and home-like atmosphere. These weekly experiential learning sessions were based on curricula designed by UNISTAPS for center-instruction and home application. Parents kept their own records of child progress. Procedures were developed for individual evaluations of parent and child progress. (Northcott, Winifred and Fowler, Shirley A. "Developing Parent Participation" in Lillie, David L. and Trohanis, Pascal L. (eds.) Teaching Parents to Teach., 1976.)

51. THE INFANT DEVELOPMENT CENTER (IDC)

Established for serving developmentally or behaviorally disturbed children (birth to 3 years old), the program objective for parents was to provide support and specific instructional training in developmental education, either in-home or in-center, depending on needs. Staff included a speech pathologist, social worker, occupational therapist, two teachers, and a staff nurse, who conducted home visits and sometimes taught behavior modification techniques (when appropriate) to parents. (Birr, Jack. The Infant Development Center. Infant Development Center, Mission, Kansas.)

52. UCLA INFANT STUDIES PROJECT

An educational intervention program for high risk infants was aimed at improving child-rearing abilities by direct parent training. Through home and clinic visits, an intervention team evolved an individualized program for each infant, and trained the mother to respond appropriately to her infant by different techniques, depending on assessed needs and strengths of the family. (Kass, Ethel R. et. al. Educational Intervention with High-Risk Infants. California University L.A., L.A. Neuropsychiatric Institute., 1974.)

53. PORTAGE PROJECT

The project which served multiply handicapped preschool children over a wide rural area, provided for home-based parent training in the implementation of an individualized curriculum and behavioral program. A home teacher (trained professional or paraprofessional) visited each family weekly for about 1 1/2 hours, and presenting a weekly format of 3 behavioral goals, taught the parents "what" and "how" to teach, to reinforce, and to record. A success rate of 91% on individual prescriptors was found and 60% of the parents learned how to plan curriculum without help. (Shearer, Marsha S. "A Home Based Parent Training Model" in Lillie, David L. and Trohanis, Pascal L. (eds) Teaching Parents to Teach., 1976.)

54. HOME TEACHING PROGRAM AT THE BOSTON CENTER FOR BLIND CHILDREN

During home visits of visually impaired children (0-3 years old), the teacher provided a model for parent instruction based upon an individual prescriptive treatment plan, and directed family efforts through explanation, discussion, observation, and correction. Evaluation reports were continuously maintained by the home visitor in both child progress and family teaching efforts. (Bernstein, Susan. Why Severely Impaired Infants and their Families Need Help, the Earlier--the Better. Boston Center for Blind Children, Mass., 1974.)

55. COMMUNICATIVE DISORDERS AND PARENT TRAINING PROGRAM

The parent-training component of this rural program for children with speech, hearing, and language handicaps, consisted of 1) an intensive, 8-week summer training course, 2) follow-up home-visit phase. The short course was supplemented by take-home materials, including a programmed self-instructional text in behavior modification, and by practical experience in curriculum development and in the classroom. Home training objectives were developed during the 2nd phase, with demonstrations and reviews conducted by the home visitor. (Jelinek, Janis and Kasper, Andrea. "Exchanging Information" in Lillie, David L. and Trohanis, Pascal L. (eds) Teaching Parents to Teach., 1976.)

56. REGIONAL INTERVENTION PROGRAM (RIP)

RIP was a successful consumer-operated program engaging a few special educators as trainees and a few resource personnel. The management, implementation and evaluators were conducted by volunteers and parents. The parent-training component, operated entirely by parents, was based upon principles of behavior modification. (Weigerink, Ron and Parrish, Vince. "A Parent Implemented Preschool Program" in Lillie, David L. and Trohanis, Pascal L. (eds) Teaching Parents to Teach., 1976.)

57. NORTH DAKOTA MHMR CENTER PRESCHOOL AND SCHOOL PROGRAMS

This center operated several simultaneous parent-education components for preschool children: 1) educational program for parents of normal children, which basically involved initial special training by a community leader, who then trained other parents to implement the program; 2) home program for developmentally handicapped children, whereby parents are trained weekly by an educational specialist to provide home treatment; and 3) home-center-based program for the more severely handicapped, whereby children receive service at the center; parents are trained in behavior modification for home application. (Gingold, William and Flamer, George B. A Comprehensive Mental Health Program for Preschool and School-Age Children in Rural and Non-urban Areas. Southeast Mental Health and Retardation Center, Fargo, North Dakota, 1975.)

58. MATERNAL INCENTIVES IN DAY CARE

Research project to investigate the use of financial incentives as a method for initiating and maintaining involvement in a parent education program. Twelve weekly sessions were offered with the Parents Are Teachers Too Program. (Boger, Robert P. and others. Maternal Involvement in Day Care: A Comparison of Incentives. Final Report, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Institute for Family and Child Study, May 1974.)

59. EFFECTS OF SUPPLEMENTAL PARENT PROGRAM

Research project to investigate the effects of short-term supplemental parent and classroom programs with mothers of preschool children in day care. Training focused on increasing positive parent-child interactions after a twelve-week intervention period. (Boger, Robert P. and Andrews, Mary P. Early Social Development: Parent and Child Programs. Michigan State University, East Lansing, Institute for Family and Child Study, June 30, 1975.)

60. PROJECT PREPARE

A program designed to teach educationally disadvantaged parents adult basic education skills in their own homes and show the what and how to teach their preschool children. (Butte Vocational-Technical Center Project to Teach Educationally Disadvantaged Parents, Butte Vocational-Technical Center, Montana, 1973.)

61. MEMPHIS HOME BASED EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAM

Paraprofessional home visitors pay weekly visit to parents of deprived three and four year olds enrolled in program and hold weekly meetings. (Conley, Virginia. Come On, Parents, Participate! Paper presented at "Toward the Competent Parent: An Interdisciplinary Conference on Parenting," Atlanta, Georgia, February 1977.)

62. PROJECT TRAIN

Community based course designed to teach parents tehcniques and activities to reinforce children's reading skills. Four meetings with topics and activities dealing with reading. (Deffenbaugh, Sue A. Helping Your Child in Reading; Parent Education Program Minicourse. Hartford Public Schools, Connecticut; Hartford University, West Hartford, Connecticut, 1976.)

63. DES MOINES FAMILY LEARNING PROJECT

Multifamily center provides a variety of services and resources, one of which is a program to show parents effective methods of helping children learn how to read and solve family conflicts. (The Des Moines Family Learning Project. Des Moines Area Community College, Ankeny, Iowa; Des Moines Public Schools, Iowa, 1975.)

64. EARLY CHILDHOOD LIBRARY PROJECT

This project trained parents and babysitters to teach preschool children by using educational games and materials supplied by the library, including individual and group use. Project serves one of the poorest areas in the country. (East, Barbara. Early Childhood Creative Library Interim Report. Northwestern Regional Library, Elkin, N.C., Yadkin Valley Economic Development District, Inc., Walnut Cove, N.C., 1975.)

65. EARLY STIMULATION OF LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

Longitudinal study effects of early language stimulation with five month infants with weekly home tutoring sessions with the parents. (Fowler, William and Swenson, Amy. The Influence of Early Stimulation on Language Development. Paper presented at The Biennial Meeting of The Society for Research in Child Development, Denver, Colorado, April 12, 1975.)

66. PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN REMEDIAL READING

Title I program designed to involve parents in the reading process of their elementary school children in the home and at school using weekly reports, open house sessions, workshops and home visits. (Greenfield, Carol Sue. Stimulating Parent Involvement in Remedial Reading Programs: Strategies and Techniques. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Reading Association (22nd), Miami Beach, Florida, May 2-6, 1977.)

67. LENOX EARLY CHILDHOOD OUTREACH PROGRAM

Program designed to train parents of preschool children to provide informal learning experiences in the home using tutors before entering pre-kindergarten. Used parent-teacher aides. (John, Thomas. Lenox Early Childhood Outreach Program for Parents: An Evaluation Study. Final Report, DHEW/OE, Washington, D.C., July 15, 1975.)

68. CLINCH-POWELL EDUCATIONAL COOPERATIVE EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAM

Large scale home based parent oriented program in rural Appalachian counties uses home visits, mobile classrooms and TV program. Model developed by the Appalachia Educational Laboratory. (Johnson, Vicki M. and O'Fallon, O. K. Clinch-Powell Educational Cooperative Early Childhood Education Program Evaluation Report. Tennessee University, Knoxville, Bureau of Educational Research and Service, 1975.)

69. HOME BASED INFANT EDUCATION PROJECT

Large scale research project to compare home based use of play, language and social development curricula delivered through a series of home visits over two years. The children range in age from one year to 2½ years. Intensive tests and observations were used at regular intervals for six groups representing combinations of curricula with emphasis on direct tutoring and through the mother. (Kessen, William and others. Variations in Home-Based Infant Education: Language, Play and Social Development. Final Report, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, August 1975.)

70. ESSENTIAL EARLY EDUCATION PROJECT

Home based parent education program designed to provide home tutoring and special services to five year old children before they entered first grade. (Knight, Martha F. and others. 1972-73 Report of the Essential Early Education Project. Vermont University, Burlington, College of Education, 1973.)

71. EDUCATIONAL INTERVENTION IN A PEDIATRIC CLINIC PLAYROOM

Cognitively oriented intervention program for parents of preschoolers aged two-three based in a pediatric clinic playroom. Uses professionals and paraprofessionals. (Morris, Ann G. How to Set Up An Educational Intervention Program in A Pediatric Clinic Playroom. Mount Sinai School of Medicine, NY, 1976.)

72. JUNIPER GARDENS PARENT COOPERATIVE SCHOOL

Cooperative school setting provides setting that enables parents to acquire skills in early childhood teaching. (Schiefelbusch, R. L. Juniper Gardens Parent Cooperative Preschool. Final Report, Kansas University, Lawrence, Bureau of Child Research, 1970.

73. PARENT ASSISTED LEARNING STRATEGIES

Early intervention program for parents of infants 12 to 36 months old, using paraprofessionals to train parents to increase psychomotor development of children. Home based program. (Schrock, John H. Parent Assisted Learning Strategies: The Development of An Early Intervention Program for Parents and Their Infants. Sacramento City Unified School District.)

74. SOUTH DOUGLAS COUNTY EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROJECT

Community coordinators bring teaching ideas and materials to the homes of participating three to five year olds and handicapped children from birth to age five. Both demonstration and direct teaching take place in the home and group meetings in the center. (South Umpqua School District. South Douglas County Early Childhood Education Project. First Year Evaluation Report, July 1, 1971 to June 30, 1972, South Umpqua School District, Myrtle Creek, Oregon, 1972.)

75. PARENTS AS TREATMENT RESOURCES

Parent training program for low achieving second to sixth graders. Content is reading and mathematics. Uses self-contained instructional packages. (Effectiveness of Parents as a Treatment Resource in Rural Areas. Final Report, November 1976, Utah State University, Logan, Exceptional Child Center.)

76. MOTHERS AS KEY EDUCATORS

Preschool intervention program with school prescribed tasks for mothers of pre-kindergarten children. (Walton, Mildred. Mothers As Key Educators of Their Preschool Children, Harwell Road Elementary School, Atlanta, Georgia, September 1973.)

77. PARENT PARTICIPATION READING CLINIC

Home based remedial tutoring by parent or older sibling as paret of a community based child health care agency. Participants were educationally disadvantaged elementary school children and their parents. (Wise, James H. Parent Participation Reading Clinic: A Research-Demonstration Project. Final Report, 1972. Children's Hospital of the District of Columbia. Washington, D.C.)

78. TEACHING STYLES OF MOTHERS

Study of the effects of weekly home visit intervention program designed to further effective parenting of low income, low education families of 0 to 5 year old children. Training was conducted by researchers. (Wright, Charlene J. and others. A Videotape In-Home Study of the Social and Educational Teaching Styles of Mothers and Their Five Year Olds, 1975.)

79. NON-CATEGORICAL EDUCATION FOR PRESCHOOL CHILDREN

Program designed to serve both delayed and non-developmentally delayed children in a preschool setting. Parent Education component uses trained staff for home visits, group sessions and individual sessions dealing with language, motor, sensorimotor and social development. Behavior management skills are also taught to parents. (Bricker, Diane D. and Bricker, William A. Non-Categorical Education for the Preschool Child, 1975. Mailman Center for Child Development. University of Miami. Miami, Florida.)

80. CALIFORNIA EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Large scale program involving 1,300 schools and children from kindergarten to third grade in California. Parent involvement is vital part of program; parent education activities designed to help parents understand child growth and development, are carried through special seminars, classes in schools and mobile classrooms, observation of children, small group meetings, parent-teacher conferences, home visits, and home school communications in the form of materials. (California State Department of Education. Early Childhood Education in Action: The Second Year. Office of Information/Dissemination, 1975.)

81. THE PARENTING PROGRAM FOR THE PREVENTION OF CHILD ABUSE

A hospital based program for the prevention of child abuse employs home visits to upgrade environment and to prevent physical abuse of children up to six years of age. Concentrates on four areas: psychological support for parents, social service referrals, resolution of inner conflicts and parenting skills training. (Gabinet, Laille. The Parenting Program for The Prevention of Child Abuse. Cleveland Metropolitan General Hospital, Ohio.)

82. PARENT EDUCATION AND PRESCHOOL PROGRAM

Parent involvement as volunteers in classroom is complemented by discussion groups and participation in advisory councils. The topics for discussion are generated by parents with evening groups designed to involve fathers. Also home visits are part of program. (Jefferson County Public Schools. A Parent Education and Preschool Program with Added Dimensions. Jefferson County Public Schools, Lakewood, Colorado, 1975.)

83. NEW MOTHER'S SELF-CONFIDENCE

Program designed to enhance new mother's self-confidence in their maternal role to promote optimal mother-infant interaction during the first six months. Eight week educational program provided psychological support and information in group meetings with a leader. (Kleinman, Harriet M. Effects of a Mother-Infant Program on Positive Feelings of New Mothers: A Pilot Investigation, June 1977.)

84. COUNTY WIDE DAY CARE PROGRAM

Day care program serving Black and White children in facilities located in housing projects and churches. Parental involvement and home visiting used to teach child care skills and to facilitate use of community services. (Mecklenburg County. Final Evaluation of the Trhee Year Project of The Mecklenburg County Department of Social Services Agency Operated Child Development Day Care Program, Mecklenburg County Department of Social Services, Charlotte, N.C., May 1972.)

85. TRAINING MOTHERS TO HELP CHILDREN SOLVE PROBLEMS

Study to train mothers of inner city Black preschoolers to train their children in interpersonal problem solving skills. Ten week training sessions on groups dealing with games and activities for language and interpersonal thinking skills. Mother trained four-year-old-child for 15 minutes daily. (Shure, Myrna B. and Spivack, George. Training Mothers to Help Their Children Solve Real-Life Problems. Hahnemann Community Mental Health Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, April 1975.)

86. FAMILY DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Development of parenting support for new families. Parenting groups of six to ten couples met for six weeks before and six weeks after delivery, and then once a month for four months. Group leaders integrate direct teaching of child development with sharing of experiences. Topics deal with both infant and adults. (Wandersman, Lois Pall and Wandersman, Abraham. Facilitating Growth for All the Family in the Adjustment to a Newborn. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the National Conference on Family Relationships, New York, October 1976.)

87. BILINGUAL /ESL PROGRAMS FOR MIGRANT CHILDREN

Describes migrant education programs for children in La Grulla-Ephrata area. Parent involvement in the form of paid staff members and parent education in GED and ESL and nutrition courses. (Arnow, Beth. Bilingual/ESL Programs for Migrant Children. New Mexico State University, March 1977.)

88. CLOVIS-PORTALES BILINGUAL EARLY CHILDHOOD PROGRAM

Bilingual early intervention program. Parental involvement component provided parents with training in child development and preschool education through home visits. (Askins, Billy E. and others. Clovis-Portales Bilingual Early Childhood Program: Second Year Evaluation Study (1973-74). Adobe Educational Services, Lubbock, TX; Clovis Public Schools, New Mexico, May 1974.)

89. LATIN AMERICAN PRESCHOOL

Six week bilingual preschool program for Latin American children to prepare them for kindergarten; a component was parent education in the home through home visits, weekly newsletters and bilingual materials. (Dixon, Brook. Latin American Preschool. Okland University, Rochester, Michigan, School of Education, 1974.)

90. PROGRAM FOR NEWLY ARRIVED PUERTO RICAN FAMILIES

Comprehensive progrma to facilitate adjustment of newly arrived Puerto Rican families. Includes a parent involvement component to facilitate communicating and understanding schools and training teachers and paraprofessionals to use instructional materials. (Dixon, Margaret A. and Duncan, Nellie R. Facilitating the Adjustment to and Participation in the Life of the School and Community by Newly Arrived Puerto Rican Pupils and Their Parents. Maxi I Report, Ed.D. Dissertation, Nova University, September 1974.)

91. HOME BASED BILINGUAL BICULTURAL PROGRAM

Home based parent education component of a bilingual bicultural preschool program; involves parents in decision-making process concerning their child's education. (Hahn, Joyce and Dunstan, Virginia. The Child's Whole World: A Bilingual Preschool that Includes Parent Training in the Home. Young Children, 30;4;281-288, May 1975.)

92. FLORENCE-FIRESTONE PROJECT

Use of English as a second language teaching project to develop home school communication; content of lessons dealt with home-school-community communication skills; use of community resources and increased involvement in PTA, Board and other pbulic meetings. Target Spanish speaking parents. (Los Angeles Unified School District. "Building Communication Skills: Home-School-Community." July 1, 1970 to June 30, 1972, Florence-Firestone Project, Final Report, Los Angeles Unified School District, California, 1972.)

93. MIGRANT PARAPROFESSIONALS

Extended family members trained as paraprofessionals in a migrant preschool. Professional teacher serves as back up for mothers and other relatives. Mobile component follows the migrant children from place to place, while stationary centers operate year-round. (McConnell, Beverly. Training Migrant Paraprofessionals in Bilingual Mini Head Start. Final Evaluation, 1974-75 Program Year, Progess Report No. 7, Washington State Intermediate School District 104, Ephrata, September 1975.)

94. PARENT CHILD EDUCATION PROJECT

Preschool program for four-year-old-children, parent participation and parent education component used parent as teacher with two monthly observation periods and two monthly evening group meetings to promote home enrichment. Program is bilingual for Mexican American and Yacqui Indian children. (Slaughter, Helen B. Effect of Parent Involvement in an Early Intervention Program upon Enviornmental Process Variables Related to Achievement. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C., March 30-April 3, 1975.)

95. PARENTS ASSIST IN OCCUPATIONAL DECISION MAKING

Parents of 10th and 11th grade students were trained in six sessions to acquire skills to help child explore career alternatives. Parents instructed by counselor. (Walters, Nancy R. Parents: Key People to Assist in Occupational Decision Making (Project No. 1100). Final Report. Missouri State Department of Education, Jefferson City, Missouri. 44 pp. August 31, 1974.)

96. PARENT EDUCATION THROUGH LECTURE DISCUSSION SERIES

Upper middle class mother trained in child rearing through a lecture discussion approach in five sessions dealing with intelligence, language development, infancy, and parent role. (Wulf, Kathleen M.; Bartenstein, Evelyn. An Attempt at Parent Education Through a Lecture-Discussion Series. 15 pp. 1975.

97. PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN FOLLOW THROUGH

Parents are trained to serve as paraprofessional teachers in elementary school classes through a progression of increasing experience and training. (Fallon, Berlie J. (ed.) 40 Innovative Programs in Early Childhood Education, Fearon Publishers, California. 1973.

98. FERGUSON-FLORISSANT HOME/SCHOOL PROGRAM

Preschool program for four-year-old children. Parent involvement in the form of teacher aides and home instruction to parents through home visits in which home activity packets are given to parents and instruction on their use is offered. (Fallon, Berlie J. (ed.) 40 Innovative Programs in Early Childhood Education. Fearon Publishers, California. 1973.)

99. CHILD-PARENT CENTER ACTIVITY PROGRAM

Parents help and instruct their children at home and participate in highly structured instruction programs for their preschool children, kindergarten and 1-3 grade children. Supplementary activities and services are provided by a variety of personnel. (U.S. Office of Education. Educational Programs That Work. Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, California. 1976.)

100. FAMILY ORIENTED STRUCTURE PRESCHOOL ACTIVITY

Designed to involve parents and four-year-old children in activities to stimulate and reinforce family interaction. Parents participate as facilitators and are instructed in groups on how to teach children. Materials are distributed for home use and stress cognitive development. (U.S. Office of Education. Educational Programs That Work. Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, California. 1976.

101. PROJECT HOME BASE

Designed to support and enhance parents teaching/parenting behaviors. Weekly home visit by paraprofessional home educator who presents parents with individualized tasks for children and provides general child development information. (U.S. Office of Education. Educational Programs That Work. Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, California. 1976.)

102. PARENT READINESS EDUCATION PROJECT

Parent education component consists of one morning a week class for child and parent, home activities and weekly group discussion sessions on child development and parenting. (U.S. Office of Education. Educational Programs That Work. Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, California. 1976.)

103. SANTA BARBARA FAMILY CARE CENTER

Designed for low income Mexican American families, the programs attempt to expand the mother's skills and knowledge of child rearing practices, increase her skills in dealing with institutional environment and programs. Mother's component impact on child rearing repertoire and self-concepts. (Sonquist, Hanne, et.al. A model for Low-Income and Chicano Parent Education Final Report, Santa Barbara Family Care Center, California, 1975.)

104. PARENT ORIENTATION PROGRAM

Program designed to improve parental knowledge about school reading and mathematics requirements for their children and school information via family workers. (Ellis, Ronald S. Parent Orientation Program. New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY Office of Educational Evaluation, June 1976.)

105. STUDENT-PARENT ACTIVITIES CENTER

Program designed to involve parents in the education of their children, increase parental knowledge and participation in school and parental influence over school attendance of fifth through eighth grade children. Weekly group discussions with help from school and neighborhood workers and family workers. (Ellis, Ronald S. Student-Parent Activities Center. New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY Office of Educational Evaluation, June 1976.)

106. LEARNING RESOURCES CENTER

Learning resource center for parents with materials that can be checked out (toys and records, etc.); early childhood education specialists available for assistance. (Heberle, Jeanne. Learning Resources Center: Increasing Parent Competence. Louisville and Jefferson County Community Coordinated Child Care, Kentucky, February 1977.)

107. EDUCATION IN ACTION PROGRAM

Community health education project for elementary and junior high school students and their parents. Focus is knowledge and awareness of prevention and treatment of health problems through workshops. (Robin, Fay. Education in Action, School Year 1975-1976. New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY, Office of Educational Evaluation, 1976.)

108. PARENT RESOURCE AND TUTORIAL CENTER

Program designed to serve elementary school children in third to sixth grade who were below level in math and reading and to educate parents about social and educational problems and use of community resources using parent workshops. (Schwartz, Lester J. Parent Resource and Tutorial Center, School Year 1975-1976. New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY, Office of Educational Evaluation, 1976.)

109. FAMILY INVOLVEMENT COMMUNICATION SYSTEM

Program designed to train low SES parents to train middle SES teachers to communicate with low SES parents and children in a Title I elementary school. (Sheldon, Judith. An Analysis of A Family Involvement-Communication System in a Title I Elementary School. Final Report, 1973.)

110. HELP NEIGHBORHOOD CENTER PROGRAM

Program designed to inform parents of fifth through eighth grade children about health problems and community concerns. Workshops on venereal disease, drug abuse, welfare rights, mental health, etc. (Siperstein, Gary N. Help Neighborhood Center Program, School Year 1975-1976. New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, NY, Office of Educational Evaluation, 1976.)

111. SCHOOL HOMEWORK AS FOCUS OF INTERVENTION

Mental health center program to teach parents to manage homework problems as a part of a broader effort to teach effective ways to teach behavior management. Content was behavior modification techniques taught by parents who were graduates of program in daily training sessions with their children for seven weeks. (Baenninger, Louise P. and Ulmer, Loretta I. School Homework as a Focus of Intervention Between Parents and Children. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Western Psychological Association (56th), Los Angeles, California, 1976.)

112. PROJECT PATROL

A home based parent-peer leader approach to teach behavior modification curriculum in small natural groups. Eight sessions dealing with learning experiences, self-concept, social skills, etc. (Cooperative Educational Service Agency. Project Patrol: Evaluation (Second Operational Year) and Proposal for Continuation Grant (Third Operational Year). Cooperative Educational Service Agency 3, Gillett, Wisconsin, 1972.)

113. TRAINING PARENTS IN CHILD MANAGEMENT SKILLS

School based groups of parents of elementary school children learn child management skills in seven to 12 weekly sessions using operant techniques. (Hamm, Phillip M., Jr.; Lyman, David A. Training Parents in Child Management Skills with the School as the Agent of Instruction. Lincoln Public Schools, Nebraska, 1973.)

114. IMPROVING CHILD MANAGEMENT PRACTICES OF PARENTS

Fourteen parent-teacher study discussion groups were carried out using adlerian model of child management in elementary schools. (Adreani, Arnold J., and McCaffrey, Robert. Improving Child Management Practices of Parents and Teachers. Maxi I Practicum. Final Report. 172 pp. October 1974.)

115. PARENT CHILD COMMUNICATION ABOUT SEXUALITY

Orientation meetings were conducted to inform parents about content of health education unit about sexuality and family life to improve home communication about family life and sexuality. (Goodman, Barry, and Goodman, Norman. Effects of Parent Orientation Meetings on Parent-Child Communication about Sexuality and Family Life. Family Coordinator, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 285-290. July 1976.)

116. MOTHER-TODDLER GROUPS

Young mothers of toddlers meet for groups discussions with children present in a nursery school setting. Curriculum involved observation of children and discussion of concerns led by experienced professional. (Lieber, Madeleine. Mother-Toddler Groups as a New Source for Parent Education. Master's Thesis, California State University. 135 pp. May 1975.)

117. COMMUNITY SEX EDUCATION PROGRAM

Community leaders trained to help parents become more effective sex educators of their own children. (Scales Peter; Everly, Kathleen. A Community Sex Education Program for Parents: Family Coordinator, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 37-43. January 1977.)

118. BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA

Through the use of a home visitor and 24 audiotapes, 80 parents of children 3 - 5 years of age learn how to improve their communication skills, develop positive attitudes and parenting skills, and establish individual personal improvement through positive changes in attitudes. (Together is Best - Families and Schools. Findings of the Parent Education Demonstration Project in Region IV.Education Improvement Program. Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. August 1976.)

119. GREEN COUNTY, ALABAMA

40 parents of 3-4 year-old children learn about child growth and development and how to participate and take advantage of health, welfare, and educational resources in the community through a home visitation program. The program utilizes 4 paraprofessional home visitors for weekly visits to participants' homes. (same source as above)

120. HUNTSVILLE, ALABAMA

300 Parents are trained to guide the education of their young children through parent workshops organized by a parent coordinator and parent aide in this ESAA-funded program. (same source as above)

121. MOBILE, ALABAMA

This ESAA program trains about 140 parents of elementary school children in the principles of developing positive parent/child relationships and makes them knowledgeable of their child's school curriculum. There are altogether 15 workshops, each on a different topic. (same source as above)

122. MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA

The objectives of this ESAA program are to teach parents to supplement at home instruction which uses the "learning based reading program" materials and to educate parents in the principles of child growth and development and positive parenting skills. This is accomplished through 15 parent workshops in each of three schools and a toy lending library in each school. The community/school resource coordinator organizes the workshops. (same source as above.)

123. MONTGOMERY, ALABAMA

Eleven workshops at a public school are held to train 100 parents of preschool children how to prepare their children for entrance into public school. The parent education coordinator organized the workshops with the help of ESAA teachers and aides. (same source as above)

124. ALACHUA COUNTY, FLORIDA

40 parents with preschool aged children (0-36 months) learn about family development, parenting, and how to be effective teachers of their own children through weekly classes and a toy lending library in this ESAA project. A project director and aide run the classes. (same source as above)

125. BROWARD COUNTY, FLORIDA

76 parents of 3 and 4 year old children learn parenting and child management skills through attending five bi-monthly workshops and receiving telephone and home visit contacts by ESAA aides. This project is staffed by a project director and 4 ESAA aides.(same source as above)

126. CLARK COUNTY, GEORGIA

This ESAA project utilizes 4 kindergarten teachers and 1 home-school coordinator to train 110 parents of preschool children how to prepare their children for entrance into the public school system. Limited home visitation and five workshops. (same source as above)

127. DOOLY COUNTY, GEORGIA

120 parents participate in ten parent training workshops at three centers and receive monthly home visits to learn how to provide a home experience to their children that will improve their developmental level. A project director and aide staff the projects. (same source as above)

128. MUSCOGEE COUNTY, GEORGIA

Biweekly parent training workshops and weekly home visits are the methods utilized by this Title III project to teach 75 mothers of preschool children how to provide educational experiences, identify health needs, and use community resources in raising their children. The staff consists of a director, 5 home visitors, and a registered nurse. (same source as above)

129. RICHMOND COUNTY, GEORGIA

One project director and four home visitors serve 63 families in this ESAA project. Through five training workshops and weekly home visits, parents learn to be effective teachers of their own children and how to use community resources. (same source as above)

130. OWENSBORO, KENTUCKY

One project director, four teachers, and four aides, train 150 parents of 3 to 5 year old children in the knowledge of parenting and child growth as developmental patterns. There are 3 hour class sessions for children two days per week, parent participation in the classroom one day per week, and a weekly parent workshop. (same source as above)

131. COLUMBIA, MISSISSIPPI

Fifteen ESAA parents and their five year olds participate in this program. The parents are trained in skills to develop the capabilities in their children that they would need upon entrance into public school. Four workshops and monthly visits to the school by the parents and their children are utilized. (same source as above)

132. JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI

170 parents participate in bi-monthly workshops and receive 131 monthly home visits by project staff to learn parenting skills and teaching techniques that they can use with their children at home. A toy and instructional materials lending library is also part of the program. (same source)

133. JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI

Through the use of a project facilitator and a home visitor 25 parents and their five year old children participate in three hour classroom sessions three days per week and bi-monthly training workshops. The parents learn how to provide developmental pre-first grade experiences to their children. (same source as above)

134. EDENTON-CHOWAN COUNTIES, NORTH CAROLINA

60 parents of children kindergarten through third grade participate in center-based weekly workshops. Parenting skills and parent education methods in parents as teachers of their own children are stressed. Limited home visitation. (same source as above)

135. CHARLESTON COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA

Parents of first and second grade students attend monthly parent meetings and receive monthly home visits to learn teaching skills, parenting skills, and develop a knowledge of community services. (same source)

136. COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA

A parent component coordinator and two home visitors serve 70 families and their preschool children by parent workshops and home visits. The objective of this program is to provide learning experiences for parents to teach their children. (same source as above)

137. HORRY COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA

50 parents and their preschool children are enrolled in this project. Teachers and high school students work with the children to provide them with preschool skills. Parents observed through a two-way mirror and through modeling developed teaching techniques they could use at home. (same source as above)

138. KERSHAW COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA

Five parent involvement aides worked with 200 low achievers in elementary school twice per week in remedial activities while a consultant organized six parent training workshops at a nearby university to teach the parents how to be effective teachers of their children. (same source as above)

139. ORANGEBURG, SOUTH CAROLINA

70-75 parents of preschool children attend weekly parent training workshops at an elementary school organized by a parent coordinator to learn activities and skills to promote child development. (same source as above)

140. CARROLL COUNTY, TENNESSEE

The purpose of this program is to assist preschool high risk children in certain areas of development and to implement a parent involvement program. Home visits are made weekly when the home visitor explains and leaves an educational toy or material to be used by the parent and child. (same source as above)

141. CHATTANOOGA, TENNESSEE

This project utilized a project director, a writer/development specialist, and a planning and evaluation specialist to develop parent training materials and curricula. (same source as above)

142. CLAIBORNE COUNTY, TENNESSEE
CLINCH-POWELL EDUCATIONAL COOPERATIVE

Parent workshops (weekly to monthly) a mobile classroom, and weekly home visits made by paraprofessionals along with a toy and materials library are the methods by which this project seeks to provide educational experiences to 110 three and four year olds and to develop knowledge and skills in the parents so as to enable them to become effective teachers of their children. (same source as above)

143. GREENE COUNTY, TENNESSEE

Weekly classroom sessions for children, weekly home visits and monthly parent meetings are ways that this program provides educational experiences for preschool children, promotes parent involvement in the child's education, and helps families become aware of community resources. The staff consists of 1 project director, 4 home visitors, and a nurse. (same source as above)

144. MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE

Parent meetings and home visits by 32 home visitors help 480 families (480-520 three and four year olds) acquire skills needed to learn and teach in the home. The program takes place both in centers located in 8 elementary schools and in the participants' homes. (same source as above)

145. MURFREESBORO, TENNESSEE

The objectives of this program are to increase parents' knowledge of child development and to make them more aware of the importance of the early years in subsequent development and to provide materials and techniques to help parents become teachers of their children. These objectives are met through the use of a mobile classroom. Parent workshops held twice monthly, and limited home visitation. 75 families participate in the program. A project director, 4 teachers, and 4 paraprofessionals staff the program. (same source as above)

146. OAK RIDGE, TENNESSEE

157 parents of preschoolers (1/2 handicapped) are enrolled in this program. The stated objective is to provide opportunities for parental involvement for the parents of preschoolers enrolled in Title I and Head Start programs. Parents visit project classrooms frequently to observe, teach, and discuss their children's progress. Teachers visit each home twice a year. Five teachers and 10 aides staff the program. (same source)

147. NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

176 parents participate in this program and learn the skills necessary to teach their children at home, reinforcing what they learn in school. Children develop the skills and attitudes necessary for school achievement. Weekly home visits and mobile classrooms with both teachers and aides. (same source as above)

148. TIPTON COUNTY, TENNESSEE

63 mothers learn through weekly home visits, a mobile classroom and parent meetings how to provide educational experiences to stimulate language, psychomotor, and social skills of their children. One teacher, 4 home visitors, and 1 aide staff the program. (same source as above)

APPENDIX C

Dimensions of Parent Education Programs
Preliminary Draft of Parent Education Survey Questionnaire
Parent Education Pilot Interview

DIMENSIONS OF PARENT EDUCATION PROGRAMS

1. Program identification dimension.

   Program name

   Sponsor agency

   Geographical location

   Central facility address

   Name of director/coordinator

   Program/component budget

   Budget duration

   Source(s) of funding

2. Target population and participant characteristics dimension.

   Eligibility restrictions

   Children's age/grade range

   Ethnicity of participants

   Number of participants

   Recruitment/selection/assignment to program

   Attrition/drop out rate

   Needs assessment activities performed

      parent needs

      children needs

      program/agency needs

3. Program staff characteristics dimension.

   Total number of full-time equivalents (paid staff)

   Type of staff

      administrative

      instructional

      volunteer

Sex ethnicity and age of staff

Staff recruitment, selection and training

Type and intensity of training

Consultant availability

4. Program content and delivery modes.

Stated goals/objectives

for parents

for children

for staff/teacher/program

Program length/duration

Program intensity/volume in number of parent/hours

Specific program activities/components

frequency

average participation (number of people)

average duration in hours

staff/participant ratio

location/setting

specific objectives/goals for activity

materials used

commercially available

program developed

General procedure and operation of program

5. Program evaluation design and instruments dimension.

Who has the role/function of evaluator

What are the evaluation questions

about parents

about children

about teachers/staff

about program

Evaluation design

Evaluation instruments used

standardized

program made

type of instrument

Use of program records

Disposition of evaluation data/report

6. Rationale/motivation for program dimension.

Characteristics of ideologist/promoter of program

education and experience

professional connections

role in institution/agency

Process of selection of content and delivery mode of program

alternatives considered

source of information and/or influence

criteria used for decision

Process of identification, recruitment and selection of staff

Process of identification, recruitment and selection of participants

needs assessment

determination of priorities

Brief narrative history of program development and implementation

7. Sociocultural context of program dimension.

General characteristics of community

productive activities (economic base)

size

socioeconomic/ethnic/language make-up

stability of population (migration patterns)

Identified community support systems for program

Identified barriers for program in the community

8. Needs perceived by parent education leaders/promoters dimension.

Needs for equipment and supplies

Needs for instructional materials

type (format) preferred

language of materials

specific content

Needs for training and technical assistance

timing and location preferred

content of training and priorities

Other needs

information and referral

dissemination

public relations

PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF
PARENT EDUCATION SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: This is a pilot form for a survey being designed to gather up-to-date information about the various Parent Education/Parent Involvement Programs and activities that are currently in operation in this area. We are interested in learning about those educational efforts directed to parents in order to effect a change in their role performance. Some of the questions might not apply to your Program, since the survey is designed to be applicable to a wide range of Parent Education activities. Please try to answer all those questions that apply specifically to your Parent-oriented activities, program, component, courses, etc. (Program for short) In order to refine this survey form, we also ask you to mark with an asterisk (*) the margin next to any question that to you is not clearly formulated, ambiguous, etc. Any suggestions that you have to improve this form will be appreciated.

1. Program Identification. The questions in this section are designed to identify your Program as a self-contained unit, separated from other activities that your agency or organization may have that are not Parent-oriented.

Program name: _____

Agency name: _____

Location (city, county, neighborhood): _____

Office address: _____

Person in charge and title: _____

Funding and source (Please specify, if possible, funding level and period for funding) $_____ for weeks months years other ____

Name source if appropriate _____

Source is ___private ____city ____county _____state ___Federal

2. Client Population. The questions in this section are designed to characterize the parents that are served by this Program and how they become aware of this Program.

Please describe your recruitment/outreach activities. Include media use, printed materials, displays, personal contacts, referrals, etc.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Do you have any selection procedure for participants ? If yes, give criteria

_____

_____

_____

Are there any restrictions for elegibility based on sex, age, number and age of children, ethnic group, language, income, residence, membership in clubs, or any other special requirement ?

_____

_____

_____

Do you charge a fee/tuition/ etc. No Yes How much? _____

Please describe your client population in terms of the categories presented below. Use approximate percentages.

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fathers | _____ | Low income | _____ | Anglo (White) | _____ |
| Mothers | _____ | Middle income | _____ | Black | _____ |
| Couples | _____ | High income | _____ | Mexican-American | _____ |
| Families | _____ | | | Other (Specify) | _____ |

Are there any other relevant categories, such as language spoken, age of the children, special problems (single parents, teen-age mothers, etc) or other characteristics, such as foster parents, handicapped, etc.

_____

_____

3. Program personnel. The questions in this section are designed to identify the number of people (full time equivalents) that make up the Program staff, and to determine the roles they perform, their education, training, experience and other job relevant characteristics. Do not give names. List only personnel directly working with parents. If person/role also works with children give only the duties and time used working with parents. First describe roles.

Role/position 1. (Give title and describe duties)_____

_____

_____

Role/position 2. (Give title and describe duties)_____

_____

_____

Role/position 3. (Give title and describe duties)_____

_____

_____

Role/position 4. (Give title and describe duties)_____

_____

_____

For each staff member, complete the information in the table below.

| Person # | Role # (above) | SEX M | SEX F | Age | %time Empl. | Highest year school compl. | Degree | Years of Experience | Ethnicity A | Ethnicity B | Ethnicity M-A |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | | | | | | | |

Are there any special characteristics that are particularly important for the program personnel, such as being bilingual, being from a given neighborhood, being a parent, a certain age, sex, ethnic background, etc.?

_____

_____

_____

Are there any special skills, personality characteristics, educational experiences, or other personal traits that are especially important?

_____

_____

_____

_____

For each role/position listed before, please write the three most important traits or characteristics that a person should have to perform that role

Role/position 1 a._____ b._____ c._____

Role/position 2 a._____ b._____ c._____

Role/position 3 a._____ b._____ c._____

Role/Position 4 a._____ b._____ c._____

Please describe any special training provided to your staff after being hired (describe content, intensity, duration, who gave it, where, etc)( Specify role/position involved in training if not general to all staff)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. Specific Program Activities/components. The questions in this section are designed to determine with detail the various specific activities that make up your program. For each discrete activity (i.e. home visits, group discussions, parent workshop, classroom visits, etc) try to answer all questions . Multiple copies of this section are provided to be used with the activities. If you need more, use photocopy or plain sheet of paper with same format. To answer the questions refer to your current activities (i.e. since September 1977)

Describe activity _____

_____

How was the need for this activity determined?_____

_____

Specific objectives/goals for this activity _____

_____

_____

Duration/intensity ( number of sessions, length of sessions, frequency, etc. If ongoing, estimate total duration; if duration is variable, give average.

_____

Number and characteristics of participants ( give relevant information, such as age, sex, educational and income level, other characteristics)

_____

_____

_____

Program Staff involved ( give role and percent of time, staff/participant ratio or caseload, etc.)

_____

_____

Materials used (describe textbooks, guides, handouts, media, etc. If commercially available, give name and distributor)

_____

_____

_____

Evaluation (list tests, questionnaires, etc. used to determine success)_____

_____

_____

5. Program continuity/viability. The questions in this section are designed to provide information about the history and development of your program, and about the factors that have influenced its success and continuity.

Please provide a brief history of your program, giving the month and year of each significant development, noting growth and changes in the activities that led to the present program.

Please list the three most important reasons/factors that have helped in the development of your programs

1

2

3

Please list the three most important reasons/factors that have hindered the development of your program

1

2

3.

What are your projections for the future of your program ?

How do you judge or determine the relative success or failure of the activities that are undertaken and about the program in general? Describe evidence used.

Are your clients/students involved in the determination of the activities that are undertaken in you program? What percentage of the parents participate and how is this participation accomplished ?

6. Program Information.

Do you have a program description (brochure, flier) that can be distributed? How should it be requested and is there a fee ?

Write/call:

Are visitors welcome to program activites? Are program staff available for consultation, presentations, workshops, etc? Describe arrangements required and fees and contact person.

7. About yourself. Please provide the information requested so that we can confirm or clarify the information gathered.

Your name and title: _____

_____

Address: _____

_____

Office hours: A.M. P.M. Office phone: ( )

Can we call you if necessary ? Yes No Best time

Would you be available, at your convenience, for an in-depth interview dealing with Parent Education goals, methods and trends? Yes ___ No ___

Please give us your opinions about possible uses of the information that can be obtained with this survey. The following represent posibilities , not plans or purposes already decided:

1. Directory of Parent Education Programs, by counties or regions, with brief (three lines or less) descriptions of activities and goals, and name and address of person in charge. (Distributed free or at cost)

2. Directory of Parent Education Programs, by counties, cities or regions, with descriptions of all activities, client population served, staff size, level and source of funding, and name and address of person in charge. (Distributed free or at cost)

3. Data Bank kept by the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, that can be searched by request to produce lists of programs with certain characteristics (such as activities, types of clients, area of the country, etc.). (Nominal charge for search service)

4. Small Directories of Similar Programs, grouped in terms of contents, type of clients, etc. (Distributed free or at cost)

5. Other (please specify)_____

_____

Please rate the above alternatives with a check mark under your opinion

| Alternative | Very Useful | Moderately useful | Useless |
|---|---|---|---|
| Brief Directory | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| Full Directory | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| Data Bank Search | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| Similar Programs | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| Your alternative | ____ | ____ | ____ |

PARENT EDUCATION PILOT INTERVIEW

INTRODUCTIONS

Greeting. Name and position.

REASONS

As you know, we are studying ongoing parent education programs in the Austin area. We see parent education as a much needed and valuable service, so we are conducting interviews with key people involved in these programs in order to get some idea as to what the programs try to do, and how they serve the family.

APPRECIATION

Before we start, let me thank you again for meeting with me today; I appreciate your willingness to assist the project in learning more about parent education programs.

RECORDING

CONFIDENTIALITY

I'll be recording our conversation so that I won't have to take notes while we're talking. Once the information has been collected, no data will be reported by interviewee or program name. What you say will be kept in strict confidence. If at any point during our talk you would like me to turn off the recorder, please let me know. Also, since we are in the early stages of our project, any comments you might have about the interview itself will be welcomed.

REQUEST COMMENTS

First, let me begin by clarifying for myself what your position is, and what, in general the agency/school/center does.

IDENTIFICATION

1. First, what is your exact title?

2. The full name of your agency/school/center is _____.

3. The correct address is _____.

4. What is your parent education program called? (Does the parent education program have a separate name?)

AGENCY

5. Could you briefly describe the main purpose of the agency/school/center? (REFERS TO 2 ABOVE)

6. Other than parent education activities, are there any other activities that your agency carries out specifically for parents?

PROGRAM CONTENT

NOW I'D LIKE TO DISCUSS SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES THAT MAKE UP THE PARENT EDUCATION PROGRAM.

7. What kinds of activities comprise this parent education effort? (CHECK THOSE APPROPRIATE FROM THE LIST AND ADD ANY OTHERS.)
   _____ home visits
   _____ lecture series/course
   _____ discussion group/group meetings
   _____ workshop
   _____ participation in classroom/school
   _____ individual or single family counseling
   _____ group therapy
   _____ others:
   _____
   _____

(ASK 8-19 FOR EACH ACTIVITY CHECKED.)

8. Can you briefly describe how the _____ proceeds; that is, how and what takes place?
   (IF APPROPRIATE) What was (were) the topic(s) or content of the _____?

9. What are the goals for _____?

10. How many times did _____ occur?

11. How long is each _____?

12. How many weeks or months did _____ last?

13. About how many parents participated in this activity? About what percentage is that of parents served by the total agency?

14. Is _____ designed for any specific parent group?

15. Which staff members were involved?

16. What would you estimate to be the staff-parent ratio or staff caseload?

17. What materials were used?
    Are any of these commercially available?

18. Where did _____ take place?

19. How was the need for this activity determined?
    By whom?

(ASK ONCE)

20. Have the parents themselves been involved in any way in determining the kind of activities offered or the content of any of the activities?
(IF YES) How?

21. In your opinion, are any of these activities especially successful?
Why or why not?

NOW I'D LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS SPECIFICALLY ABOUT PARENTS WHO ATTEND THE PARENT EDUCATION PROGRAM.

CLIENTS

22. Do you actively recruit parents to attend your program?
(IF YES) What methods do you use? (PROMPTS: Media advertising, referral, client-staff contact, word of mouth, other)
(IF NO) How do you think parents find out about the program?

23. Can anyone who hears about the program attend, or is it designed with particular groups of parents in mind?
(PROMPTS: Ethnicity, language, age of children, characteristic of children, residence, income, parent age, parenting status: foster, single, teenage, working mothers)

I WOULD LIKE TO GET AN OVERALL PICTURE OF THE PARENTS WHO ACTUALLY ATTEND YOUR PARENTING PROGRAM.

24. Could you give me the approximate percent of <u>Mothers</u> attending your program?

| The percent of | Fathers | Low income | Anglo | English lang. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (Couples) | Middle | Black | Spanish lang. |
| | (Families) | High | Mex. Am. | Bilingual |

25. What percent are parents of Infants?
Preschoolers
School-aged children
Teenagers

26. Roughly, what is the total number of parents involved in your parent education program at any given time?

STAFF ROLES

NOW I'D LIKE TO ASK YOU ABOUT STAFFING. I'M INTERESTED IN THE DIFFERENT ROLES THAT STAFF HAVE IN THE PARENT EDUCATION PROGRAM, THE DIFFERENT JOB TITLES AND JOB DUTIES. FOR EXAMPLE, THE ROLE OF SECRETARY, WHOSE DUTIES MAY BE TO TELEPHONE PARENTS.

27. Is there a Coordinator? (CHECK)

_____ Administrator
_____ Parent-trainers
_____ Nurse
_____ Doctor
_____ Psychologist
_____ Social worker
_____ Home Visitor
_____ Secretary
_____ Consultant
_____ Volunteers
_____ Community aide
_____ Counselor
_____ Any others? (LIST)

(FOR EACH ROLE CHECKED, ASK # 28 - 37 ).

28. What is the _____exact title?

29. How many _____ are there on the staff involved in the parent education program?

30. About what percentage of the _____ time is devoted to parent education activities?

31. What, in general, are the duties of the _____with regard to the parent education program?

32. What is the ethnic breakdown of _____?

33. What are the approximate ages of the _____?

34. What sex are the _____?

35. What is the approximate educational level of _____?

36. What kind of background training and professional experiences relevant to this position did _____ have before being hired?

(ASK ONLY FOR STAFF WORKING DIRECTLY WITH PARENTS)

STAFF TRAINING

37. After being hired, did the program provide (additional) training for the _____ in working with parents?
(IF YES) How was the _____ trained?
Who did the training?
How long did the training last?
What, in general, was the _____ trained to do?

NOW I'D LIKE TO ASK YOUR OPINION ABOUT THE GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS YOU FEEL STAFF SHOULD HAVE TO WORK WITH PARENTS.

38. In your opinion, are any personal traits especially important for any of the staff positions?

39. Are any specific skills or background training especially important for any staff position?

40. Are there any other characteristics, experiences, or activities which you feel are important for someone in a staff position, such as being the same age as the participants, etc.?

41. Were any of the staff drawn from the local community?
(IF YES) Who?
Why?
How important?

PROGRAM HISTORY

I'D LIKE TO CONCLUDE THE INTERVIEW BY GETTING A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE HISTORY OF YOUR PROGRAM, SO THAT WE CAN GET SOME IDEA ABOUT THE FACTORS THAT INFLUENCED ITS DEVELOPMENT.

42. When was the program started?

43. Who funded the program initially?

44. Is that public _____ or private _____?
(IF PUBLIC) Is that ____federal ____state ____county
____city ____agency?
(IF COMBINATION OF SOURCES) Can you give me the approximate percentages from each source? (IF AGENCY) Where does the agency get its funds?

45. Who funds the program now?
Is that public _____ or private _____?
(IF PUBLIC) Is that ____federal ____state ____county
____city ____agency?
(GET PERCENT IF COMBINATION) Can you give me the approximate percentages from each source? (IF AGENCY) Where does the agency get its funds?

46. Approximately how much is your current operating budget?

47. How long does the current funding period last?

48. In general, how has the funding source and funding level changed over time?

49. Do you expect the funding level to change in the future? Why?

PROGRAM PHILOSOPHY

NOW I'D LIKE TO KNOW SOMETHING ABOUT THE PHILOSOPHY BEHIND THE PROGRAM'S ORIGIN.

50 Why was the program started?
Who saw the need for it?

51. How was it started?

52. Have there been any major changes since its inception?

53. Have there been any particular factors that have helped the program?

54. Have there been any particular factors that have hindered the operation or development of the program?

55. What do you foresee as the future for the program?
Will it continue?
As it is?
(IF NOT) How is it likely to change?

56. In your opinion, how much or how little community support has there been for the program?
Why?

PROGRAM EVALUATION

57. Have evaluations of parent education been done in this program? (IF YES) Who or what has been evaluated? (PROMPTS: Program, parents, children, lecture series)

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

58. What kinds of questions were asked in the evaluation of _____?

59. What instrument or methods of measurement were used to evaluate _____? (PROMPTS: Tests, survey, questionnaire, profiles, records)

60. Who filled out the instrument?

61. When was the evaluation done (at what point in the program)? Was the evaluation done more than once for the same group/activity? If so, when? (PROMPTS: Beginning of program, end of program, intervals)

62. Did you compare the _____ being evaluated to any other group/activity?

63. Who was responsible for preparing and administering the evaluation of _____?

64. Who analyzed the results?

65. What methods of analysis were used?

66. What were the results of the evaluation of _____?

67. What was done with the evaluation results?
(REFER TO #7. SEE IF ANY ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN OMITTED. IF YES)

68. Was there any kind of evaluation specifically for _____?
(REPEAT SET OF QUESTIONS FOR #59-63.)

PROGRAM REPLICABILITY

69. Does the program have a brochure, flyer, or written description that can be distributed to other people who might be interested in setting up a program like yours elsewhere?
(IF YES) How can it be obtained?
Is there a fee?
(IF YES) How much?

70. If someone would be interested in setting up a program like yours elsewhere, are any of your staff available for consultation or presentations?
(IF YES) What?
Who?
How are arrangements made?
Is there a fee for the _____?

71. Can visitors observe any of the activities of your program?

CLOSING REMARKS

72. Would you be available by telephone if I have any further questions? No _____ Yes_____

73. When would be most convenient to call?

74. How would you improve this interview?
Were any questions confusing or difficult to answer?

75. Do you have any further comments or ideas that were not brought out by the interview?

(EXPRESS APPRECIATION)

---

DURATION OF INTERVIEW

REMARKS AND IMPRESSIONS:

APPENDIX D

Parent Education Programs in Austin, Texas

Austin Programs: Interviews Completed

Interview Summaries

PARENT EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN AUSTIN, TEXAS

Programs Based in Educational Institutions

- At Home Program, Sims Elementary, Title I

  One of two parent education programs offered through Title One schools. One program is for four-year-olds and their families. The other is for elementary school students and their families. Both involve home visitation by a community aide; the emphasis is on home tutoring of the child by the parent.

- Bilingual Education Program, AISD Dept. of Bilingual Education, Title VII, ESEA

  In ten schools parent education utilizes community representatives. Activities include home visits and workshops.

- Child Development Laboratory, Austin High School, Home Economic Dept. AISD

  Education for parenthood for teenage mothers and their children.

- Education for Parenthood Pilot Program, Johnston High School, AISD, Title IV-C, TEA

  One program in Austin, combining education for parenthood and parent education for high school age parents and students.

- Extend-A-Care, Inc.

  Provides parent groups and seminars; topics vary and are chosen by parents. Offered in 15 elementary schools and the Friendship Community Center.

- Parent Family Life Center, Huston-Tillotson College

  Provides workshops, toy lending library and referrals.

- Parent Involvement Program, Austin Community Nursery School

  Monthly parent-staff meetings for parents of children served by the nursery utilizing outside speakers.

- Parent Involvement Program; Child, Inc., Head Start and Title XX Day Care

  Parent education component includes group discussion and home visitation.

- Parent of Handicapped Children Program; Child, Inc., Head Start and Title XX Day Care

  Parent education component includes group discussion and home visitation.

- Parent Study Groups, Becker Community Schools

  Offers an on-going parent study group covering various aspects of parenting.

- Project PAVE, Travis High School

  Tutoring workshops for parents of special education students enrolled in High School.

- Systematic Training for Effective Parenting, Rosedale-Brykerwoods Community School

  Ten week course in effective parenting.

Programs Based in Social Service Agencies or Private Organizations

- Austin Association for Children with Learning Disabilities

  General parent education discussion groups in the areas of child management, child development, and educational skills for parents of learning disabled children.

- Austin Association for Retarded Citizens.

  Group workshops on parenting of special children, rights of handicapped children.

- Austin Child Guidance Center

  Provides parent counseling and small group sessions.

- Austin Women's Center

  Holds group sessions for single parents.

- Brackenridge School-Girl Maternity Clinic

  Has a teen-age parenting program.

- Expectant Parent Program, American Red Cross, Sponsors

  Groups for expectant parents.

- Effective Parenting with Preschool Children, Austin Parent-Child Association

  Classes for parents of preschoolers, lasting about 6 weeks.

- Emergency Parenting Assistance (Hotline)

  Gives information about parent education activities, plans parent tape library.

- Family Life Enrichment Program, Child and Family Service, Inc.

  Discussion groups for parents in the areas of parenting skills, discipline, child management, self concept.

- Foster Parent Training Project, Early Childhood Development Division

  Develops and conducts foster parent training program.

- Infant-Parent Training Program, Child Mental Retardation Training, (ATC/MH-MR)

  Training and education for parents of mentally retarded infants in the areas of child development and educational activities.

- Mental Health-Mental Retardation, Department of Parent Training Program

  Trains group discussion leaders and holds group discussions for parents.

- Mothers, Inc.

  Centers on "motherhood" rather than "parenthood", provides city-wide and small neighborhood unstructured meetings.

- Parenting Course, YWCA

  Recently intended as a 3-week workshop covering parenting skills, child management and tutoring.

- Parents as Sex Educators, Planned Parenthood Center

  Six-week seminar teaching parents to be effective sex educators of their children.

- Prenatal Parent Education Program, Seton Hospital

  Classes for parents of newborns and starting group of parents of children in critical condition.

- Women, Infants and Children Program (WIC)

  Nutrition and health education for Model Cities parents and children; one-to-one counseling with family.

- Services for School-Aged Parents, Child and Family Service, Inc.

  Rural outreach program for low income teenage parents.

Programs Based in Churches

- Day Care Office, First Baptist Church

  Discussion groups on parenting. Clients drawn primarily from church.

- Mothers Club, St. Ignatius Catholic Church

  Meets once a month occassionally discussing parenting concerns.

- Day Care Center, University United Methodist Church

  Parents learning through modeling and social interaction as classroom assistants in day care setting.

AUSTIN PROGRAMS:
INTERVIEWS COMPLETED

| PROGRAM NUMBER | PROGRAM NAME | SPONSORING INSTITUTION/AGENCY |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | At Home Program | Sims Elementary School |
| 2 | Bilingual Education Program | AISD, Dept. of Bilingual Education, Title VII, ESEA |
| 3 | Child Development Laboratory | Austin High School, Home Economic Department |
| 4 | Education for Parenthood Pilot Program | Johnston High School, AISD |
| 5 | Extend-A-Care | AISD |
| 6 | Parent Involvement Program | Austin Community Nursery |
| 7 | Parent of Handicapped Children Component | Child, Inc. |
| 8 | Parent Study Group | Becker Community School |
| 9 | Project Pave | Travis High School |
| 10 | Parent Family Life Center | Huston-Tillotson College |
| 11 | Parent Education Activities | Austin Child Guidance Center |
| 12 | Family Life Enrichment Program | Child and Family Service Agency |
| 13 | Services for School-Aged Parents | Child and Family Service Agency |
| 14 | Parents as Sex Educators | Planned Parenthood Center |
| 15 | Infant-Training Program | Travis County MH-MR |
| 16 | Austin Association for Children with Learning Disabilities | (Same) |
| 17 | Parent Education Program | Austin Association for Retarded Citizens |
| 18 | Effective Parenting with Pre-school Children | APCA |
| 19 | Mothers, Inc. | Mothers, Inc. |
| 20 | Parenting Course | YWCA |
| 21 | Mothers Club | St. Ignatius Church |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 22 | Day Care Center | University United Methodist Church |
| 23 | Parenting Office | Parenting Office |

INTERVIEW SUMMARIES

I

SIMS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
AT HOME PROGRAM

IDENTIFICATION: This interview took place at Sims Elementary School with the Principal. The focus of the interview was on the At Home Program.

PARENT EDUCATION CONTENT: The At Home Program is a self-instructional program. Participants are parents of elementary school children who have reading problems and meet Title I income guidelines. There are two group meetings per year lasting two hours each. The first is to explain the program and the second is to go over and answer any questions the parents may have about the program. The actual At Home activities are all in the area of reading and consist of ten lessons for ten weeks - one per week, one activity daily. The parents learn to tutor their children with the help of two teachers and a Community Representative and the children learn to read. About one hundred fifty parents participated in this activity this year.

CLIENTS: Parents are actively recruited into the program through letters of invitation, and must meet Title I income guidelines and children must have poor reading skills. Roughly two hundred students from Sims participated in the At Home Program this year. Almost all were Black.

STAFF: The staff consists of four individuals - the Principal, two teachers, and a Community Representative. The two teachers and the Community Representative are primarily responsible for recruiting parents and distributing and explaining the kits. They keep the program going. All are college graduates with no special training or background other than teaching experience.

HISTORY: The Principal at Sims brought the At Home Program to Austin from her experience with it in Gary, Indiana. Initially the funding was from the Rockerfeller Foundation and now is through Title I. Each kit costs $25. The program has been in operation at Sims for about three years and over that time has spread to seven other Title I elementary schools in Austin. The rationale behind the program is simply that parents are the best teachers of their own children and when they are actively involved in the education of their children, their children achieve better in school.

EVALUATION: Midway through the program two forms are mailed to the parents to fill out. One solicits information about the child's progress and one solicits information about the parents satisfaction with the program. This is done again at the end of the 10 week program. Results have been "overwhelmingly positive" both in terms of the childrens' improved reading skills and in parents' satisfaction with the program.

REPLICABILITY: The program originally was only at Sims and has been replicated at other Austin schools.

AISD DEPT. OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION, TITLE VII, ESEA
BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

IDENTIFICATION: This is an interview with the Parental Involvement Specialist for the Title VII Elementary and Secondary Education Act Bilingual Program in the Department of Bilingual Education with the Austin Independent School District. The Program serves nine schools and one sixth grade center in Austin.

PARENT EDUCATION CONTENT: Methods utilized to deliver parent education services are three in number. Home visits are made by a community representative as part of the home intervention Experience Based Curriculum. The goal of the EBC is to reinforce school activities and to increase the child's learning in school. Topics covered by the community representative with the parents and child are vocabulary, reading, and writing. Home visits are made weekly for 20-40 minutes for a four month duration. There are 148 parents enrolled in the program.

Each year there are three workshops held lasting three hours each to train parents in reading, math, and cultural awareness to prepare them to be parent volunteers in the classroom. Twelve to fifteen parents participate in each workshop. Type and amount of involvement in the classroom varies with each parent.

Parent training sessions take place weekly during the nine month school year. They last about two hours each with about twelve to fifteen parents attending each session. The purpose of these sessions is to teach and increase positive parenting techniques of the participants. The Parental Involvement Specialist and occasional consultants run the parent training sessions.

CLIENTS: Parents of children who are enrolled in the Bilingual Education Program and who indicate Spanish dominance on language dominance test are the clients. The following are estimates of the parent population characteristics: low income, 100%; Mexican American, 90%; Black and Anglo, 10%; Bilingual, 75-90%; Spanish, 30%; English, 10%; infants/preschoolers, 60%; school age, 100%; teenagers, 60%; total number of parents involved, 40-50% of parents of children in the program.

STAFF: There are fifteen individuals on the staff of the AISD Title VII Bilingual Education staff. Nine community representatives (all Mexican American, bilingual, high school graduates, and with knowledge of the community) are responsible for parental involvement as far as direct day to day contact with the parent goes. The Parental Involvement Specialist and five coordinators of the bilingual staff (five Mexican Americans, one male and five females, all have Master of Arts Degrees) supervise the community representatives and are responsible for staff development and training sessions for parent volunteers. Preservice training for the community representatives is carried out during a one week workshop in August by district personnel and consultants from the Education Service Center.

HISTORY: The Bilingual Program started in 1974 as a result of pressure from the Mexican American community which, in turn, developed as a result of Mexican American children not performing well in school. The funding for the program is through Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Initially the level of funding was for $900,000 in 1974. It has gone down each year to its present level, $650-700,000, and will be cut again next year.

The most obvious problem the program has experienced is in the area of accountability to the Federal funding source, HEW. It has been difficult to measure and evaluate success in this type of program because it takes time to show change. There has been a problem in recruiting classroom volunteers and evidently the program has been hit hard in this area by the evaluators.

On the positive side, teachers and principals have developed support for the community representatives.

EVALUATION: The evaluations of the bilingual program have been done by the Austin Independent School District Office of Research and Evaluation. A pre- and post-test design with a control group was utilized for the children enrolled in the program. The criteria for the testing was the child's learning of the curriculum and achievement.

The parents were tested by means of a questionnaire administered by the community representatives measuring their attitudes and knowledge of the program, specifically, of the parent training sessions and the Home Intervention Program. Results are not complete.

REPLICABILITY: Staff of the Office of Bilingual Education are available for consultation and answering any questions about the program.

AUSTIN HIGH SCHOOL HOME ECONOMIC DEPARTMENT
CHILD DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY

IDENTIFICATION: The Child Development Laboratory is part of an education for parenthood project sponsored by the Home Economics Department located on the Austin High School Campus. High school students and trained child care aides make up the staff. The students through direct observation and contact with the children who are enrolled in the Lab learn about child development, how to care and guide children and the responsibilities of parenthood.

PARENT EDUCATION CONTENT: This turned out to be an inappropriate selection due to the fact that there is no ongoing organized parent education program being offered. There have been some efforts made in this area in the past but because all of the parents who have children enrolled in the Lab this year are working during the day no parent meetings have been held or planned.

Parents are encouraged to visit whenever they can and are able to observe their children interacting with other children and teachers through the use of an observation room.

Of the nineteen parents who presently have children in the Lab, fourteen have at one time or another visited the Lab and participated in some activity, e.g., birthday parties, toy making, classroom volunteer, field trips, etc.

CLIENTS: Currently there are ten children (five Anglo and five Mexican-American, one single-parent child) enrolled in the Lab.

There are no income or other guidelines/limitations on who may utilize the Lab's facilities.

HISTORY: The current operating budget is $19,000 per year. The Austin Independent School District funds the Lab.

EVALUATION: As far as evaluations go, the parent is asked at the beginning of the school year to fill out a six page form describing what their child can and cannot do in terms of such things as dressing themselves, feeding themselves, tying their shoes, etc. Progress in these areas can then be noted as the school year progresses. Parents are also encouraged to keep in regular contact with the Lab and give feedback to either the Director or head teacher. So far there has been a good deal of positive feedback, suggestions, and ideas from parents. They appear to be quite satisfied with the program.

EDUCATION FOR PARENTHOOD PILOT PROGRAM
AUSTIN INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT

IDENTIFICATION: The Education for Parenthood Project is a comprehensive program for male and female high school students, and is designed to enhance the quality of family life through the development of parenting skills. The project is a cooperative effort of the AISD Home Economics Department and of many community agencies with similar goals. There are projects in four Austin High School campuses.

PARENT EDUCATION CONTENT: The Education for Parenthood Pilot Project evolved from the need of present and future parents in the Austin community to gain realistic expectations and decision making skills regarding the role of responsible parenthood. High school students are given the opportunity to develop effective parenting and/or career skills through classroom instruction, guided observation, and supervised learning experiences in Infant and Family Living Centers located on four school campuses. Some of the children in the centers are infants and toddlers of students who are completing their high school education. These students participate in Education for Parenthood Courses and experiences through the Home Economics curriculum.

The Infant and Family Living Centers of the Education for Parenthood Program are modeled after accepted and proven methods of teaching child development and family living. These are the same methods which have been successfully employed in the U.S. for 80 years.

The Education for Parenthood Program is providing a service to students in AISD who are parents and would like to complete their high school education. These students are required to enroll in Education for Parenthood courses in the Home Economics Department and to fulfill educational requirements in the Infant and Family Living Centers. The service to AISD students who are parents

and for their children is the medium through which the other 96% of the students involved in the project are provided opportunities to learn about the roles and responsibilities of parenthood.

CLIENTS: The clients are high school students enrolled in one of the four site high schools who are parents and other students enrolled in Education for Parenthood courses. The program is open to all students. The combination of (1) laboratory child care facility for teaching child development and family living to high school students which (2) serves high school students and their children, and (3) is a combined community effort is unique. There are about eighteen children in the Johnston Center and twenty-three parents actively involved in the program.

STAFF: Each of the four centers has a director, two teachers (one for infants, and one for toddlers), four aides who are home economics students, and a cook. Both teachers have B.A.'s and the director has an M.A. in child development. In the Johnston Center the director is Anglo, one teacher is Anglo, and one teacher is Black.

HISTORY: The concept of teaching child development principles through directed observation and supervised experiences is a well-accepted teaching method which has been employed by colleges, universities, and public schools in the U.S. for 80 years.[1] The Austin Independent School District has been operating a successful laboratory preschool program for three and four year olds for over thirty years. Students in AISD home economics courses since before 1947 have been studying theoretical child development and family living information in the classroom and having opportunities for directed

---

[1]Osborn, D. K., Logue, C., Surbeck, E., Significant Events in Early Childhood Education. Athens, Ga: Early Childhood Education Learning Center, 1973.

observation and supervised experiences in the laboratory preschool program. The laboratory preschool at Austin High is staffed by professional home economics teachers who are trained in child development and who are experienced in teaching high school students. Students in various classes concerned with child development, home and family living, consumer education, food service, home management, nutrition, etc., participate in observation and/or direct experiences in the preschool. This participation is planned cooperatively by the home economics classroom and preschool teachers.

Historically, laboratory preschools in the U.S. have been devoted to varying degrees of teaching, research, and service. The Infant and Family Living Centers of the Education for Parenthood Program are primarily concerned with the teaching of high school students. Providing model infant centers is the medium through which high school students are guided in their study of child development and family living.

Currently, the pilot project is being funded through a Title IV-C grant from the Texas Education Agency. As the program progresses, AISD will continue to provide classroom instruction in all areas of homemaking education. Child, Incorporated, the largest community supported, Federally funded child care provider in Austin will provide the total Infant and Family Living Center Program in which AISD students observe the growth and development of infants and toddlers. In this manner, the Education for Parenthood courses, observation, and career education experiences can provide comprehensive career and parenting education for approximately 4,000 students per year at a quarterly cost of $15 per student.

EVALUATION: A formal evaluation is now being conducted by the AISD Office of Research and Evaluation (OR&E). OR&E will compare student achievement in

child development between students at project and matched non-project schools; compute cost per student per quarter; compare numbers of HECE project and non-project students who obtain employment or who pursue higher education will be assessed; compare numbers of student/parents from project and non-project schools who complete their high school education; and compare the development of center children with matched children who were cared for at home by their mothers.

REPLICABILITY: This program is one of four located in Austin High Schools.

AISD EXTEND-A-CARE

IDENTIFICATION: This was an interview with the Parent Involvement Supervisor for the Extend-A-Care Program. Extend-A-Care is an after school day care and enrichment program for children of working parents. There are eighteen centers.

PARENT EDUCATION CONTENT: Consists of bi-monthly parent meetings at each center that last 1-1/2 - 2 hours and are attended by 7 - 25 parents. Attendance varies greatly from center to center. Either the Parent Involvement Supervisor or a guest speaker from a community agency conduct the meetings. Topics for the meetings include nutrition, child management, community resources, and values clarification. The parents choose what they would like to do at each session. Sometimes they simply want to get together for a social of some type.

A parenting library has just been started along with parent discussion groups. Both are under the charge of the Parent Involvement Supervisor.

The goal of the parent activities is to disseminate as much parenting information as possible to parents.

CLIENTS: Parents who have children enrolled in the Extend-A-Care Program. Parents must either meet Title XX guidelines or pay a fee.

STAFF: Each center has one manager, an assistant manager, and an aide. Larger centers have two assistant managers. The manager and assistant managers are college graduates. The aides are community people with varied educational backgrounds. The managers and the Parent Involvement Supervisor organize the parent meetings.

HISTORY: The Parent Involvement/Education Program was started about three years ago by two University of Texas social work interns who thought that a

parent education component in the Extend-A-Care Program would be a good idea. Once it was started parents liked it and it has continued. Funding is through the Austin Independent School District, DHR, Title XX, fees, and fund raisers. Total funding is $330,000 per year for 1977.

EVALUATION: Interviewee said she is currently working on a questionnaire to be administered to parents soliciting ideas and feelings about the program.

TRAVIS HIGH SCHOOL
PROJECT PAVE

IDENTIFICATION: Travis High School is located in South Austin. The student population is almost 75% minority and numbers two thousand in total population. The PAVE Project (Parents, Academic, Vocational, Extra-curricular) is a federally funded project which has as its goals to develop academic/vocational courses for Special Education students, to develop methods by which teachers may become more aware of the needs of these students, to get parents of students involved in their children's education, and to disseminate the findings to other schools across the state.

PARENT EDUCATION CONTENT: The main purpose is to develop academic programs for Special Education students attending Travis and to disseminate them statewide. As part of the project there is a parent program in which parents of Special Education students are asked to attend monthly meetings on the school campus. Guest speakers from the school district, MH-MR, the Education Service Center, etc. act as consultants. The meetings last about two hours. Attendance has varied from about 10 to 30 parents. Topics covered include tutoring, Special Education courses and services provided by the district, and workshops on P.L. 94-142.

CLIENTS: Clients are parents of Special Education students enrolled at Travis High School. Recruitment is accomplished by door to door and telephone contact after referral of students by the school registrar to the project.

STAFF: Four people staff Project PAVE - one secretary, one coordinator, one vocational coordinator, and one resident coordinator. All staff get involved in the parent education program. At times temporary help has been hired to recruit parents and, of course, consultants from other agencies have been contracted to run some of the monthly meetings.

HISTORY: Project PAVE is one of seven pilot projects around the state that came into existence in September of 1975. The project is funded through TEA. The funds are authorized by the Education of the Handicapped Act, P.L. 93-380. This program and similar ones around the state were developed in response to P.L. 94-142 and the general movement toward advocacy for the rights of the mentally and physically handicapped. The goal of the PAVE Project is to identify Special Education students and with the help and participation of their parents develop meaningful programs, especially in the vocational area, for them.

EVALUATION: TEA has conducted two evaluations on the progress of the project over the last two years. Both have been good. The method utilized by the evaluator was to look at the project/s goals for each year and compare them to what the project had done toward meeting each goal.

AUSTIN COMMUNITY NURSERY
PARENT INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM

IDENTIFICATION: The Austin Community Nursery provides day care with a pre-school curriculum for children from low income families. Social services, health screening, nutritious meals and snacks, and a program of monthly parent involvement meetings are all part of the Nursery's program.

PARENT EDUCATION CONTENT: Consists of monthly parent staff meetings at the Nursery utilizing guest speakers from various agencies in the Austin area. The meetings last about one and one half hours and are attended on the average by 12 to 15 parents. This represents about one third of the parents who have children attending the Nursery. Planned Parenthood, the Texas A&M Extension Service, and MH/MR are some of the agencies that have provided speakers for the monthly meetings.

Parents also serve on the Nursery's Board of Directors and participate in the operation of the facility in terms of staffing, organization, and funding. For example, the parents have in the past organized fund raisers for the Nursery.

CLIENTS: Families must meet Title XX income guidelines in order to use the Nursery. Sixty-four percent are single parents. There are 59 children enrolled in the Nursery at present, representing about 50 parents. There is a core of about 15 parents who are actively involved in the Nursery. The ethnic breakdown is roughly 45% - 45% - 10% Black, Mexican American, and Anglo.

STAFF: The Austin Community Nursery is staffed by 20 individuals. One is a male. There is one director, one social worker, six teachers, and twelve teacher aides. All are involved in the Parent Education Program but the principal staff who are responsible for this component are the social worker and director. The director has an M.A., the social worker and teachers all have bachelor level degrees and experience in social work and teaching. The aides

are high school graduates.

Weekly staff meetings are held at the nursery where in-service training is provided either by the director or consultants from other agencies, e.g., Department of Human Resources or the Austin Association for the Education of Young Children.

HISTORY: The Austin Community Nursery started operating in 1973. Funding has been and continues to be through a matching grant from HEW - the 30% match coming from United Way: $36,000, and the City of Austin: $28,000. Fund raisers and fees account for another $6000. The level of funding has increased each year.

EVALUATION: There have been parent satisfaction questionnaires administered on two occasions during the monthly parent-staff meetings to ascertain what the parents might want and need in terms of workshop topics.

REPLICABILITY: The interviewee or the director can be available to consult with other day care centers interested in starting a parent involvement/education program.

CHILD, INC.
PARENT OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN COMPONENT PROGRAM

IDENTIFICATION: Child, Inc. is the local Head Start and Title XX Day Care agency. It provides social, educational, nutritional, health, and volunteer services to low income children and their families. A sequentially planned developmental program designed for children from low income families is offered. The emphasis Child, Inc. places on programming these areas gives substantial impetus to the development and application of innovative approaches to the delivery of early childhood services.

PARENT EDUCATION CONTENT: The parent education activities offered through Child, Inc. are home visitation, group meetings, and counseling sessions. The group meetings are the only regularly scheduled parent education activities. They are held at each center on a monthly basis and last from one to two hours. Participation varies from six to twenty-five parents. Parents chose specific topics for each monthly meeting, e.g., sex education, behavior management, tutoring. Home visits and counseling sessions are used only for specific reasons, e.g., health problem, to obtain parental permission for or evaluation of their child, providing information about social service programs.

CLIENTS: In order to utilize Child, Inc. facilities, and consequently participate in parent education activities, families must meet Title XX guidelines. This is the only requirement. Currently, Child, Inc. serves about 700 families.

STAFF: The director is the parent coordinator for the handicapped. She was not sure how many total staff there were at all 23 centers; however, all of the staff get involved to some degree in the parent education program. She is Anglo, mid 20's, with a master's degree in special education. There are in-service training workshops run by the director for center staff on home visitation, counseling, organizing group meetings, etc.

PROGRAM HISTORY: Child, Inc. started in 1965 as part of the war on poverty effort. Parent participation was mandated by the enabling legislation. Each Head Start center has a parent involvement component of some type. Child, Inc. is funded by HEW. The director could not give me the amount.

| Funding: | City of Austin: | $ 324,190 |
|---|---|---|
| | DPW: | 675,185 |
| | HEW: | 1036,207 |

EVALUATION: The only evaluation of the parent education component that has been attempted is the questionnaire included. The results were inconclusive. I am sure that there must have been more formal evaluations done by DHR and/or HEW but the interviewee did not know of any.

REPLICABILITY: The interviewee is available for consultation with any group or individual interested in organizing a parent education or involvement group.

BECKER COMMUNITY SCHOOL PARENT STUDY GROUP

IDENTIFICATION: This interview took place at the Child and Family Service Agency on West Sixth, following a discussion there with the interviewee representing the Parent Education Association (PEA) (as chairperson) and the parenting office coordinator. The interviewee is also a volunteer discussion group leader at Becker Community School, co-leading the "course" (which has been offered so far only once) with the Extend-A-Care parent involvement coordinator. The course was called the "parent study group;" to be called "parent discussion group" the next time offered.

PARENT EDUCATION CONTENT: The activities include some presentations, films and games, but the bulk of the sessions are mainly group discussion. The hour and one-half long sessions usually begin with some information or questions designed to lead into discussion. The goals are to (1) give some information to get people to think, and (2) to expose people to the concerns of others so that they will realize that others have similar problems and share solutions and support. This first sequence took place every other week for twelve weeks, but plans are to follow the community school calendar (every other week for eight weeks) in the future.

Out of a total of 17 enrollees, an average number of 7 attended each session, with a range from 5 to 10. Enrollees are local area residents, though anyone was welcome. Theoretically, some of the same participants will re-enroll, so that one would have an on-going group.

She gave out a pamphlet written by two instructors for the Austin Parent-Child Association (APCA) parenting course, and plans to make it available again. She also plans to draw on some experts from the community and films and other materials. The course took place at Becker School.

The course has been a goal desired by the community school leaders and staff. The interviewee thinks that this goal was most probably based upon a needs assessment of the local community.

The interviewee ended each session by allowing the participants to decide upon the content and topics of the next meeting. She found the discussion to be the most popular and seemingly worthwhile activity. The most relevant topics, in general, seemed to be discipline, communications, reward systems, and values clarification. She feels, however, that different people attended to different topics and ideas.

CLIENTS: Parents were not generally recruited, but signed up on their own, usually through Extend-A-Care or the community school or by friends. One was referred from a local agency. Anyone who heard about the program could attend. There are plans to do some publicity of the course in the future.

About 80% of the enrollees were mothers; two out of seventeen were fathers. A majority were low income, she assumes. There were two Blacks (Nigerian couple) and eleven Anglos. Though there was a range in ages of the children, most parents had children of school age.

STAFF: The interviewee spent about three hours per week during the twelve weeks in preparation, planning, and organizing. In addition to her presentations and group facilitation functions, she also reminds people about forthcoming meetings and arranges some transportation.

The interviewee is an Anglo female, aged 29 of middle income. She is married, but is not a parent. She has an M.A. in social work, and currently works half time as a program evaluator for the Department of Human Resources. She went through the first session PEA-sponsored training to be a group facilitator, and has done some reading about parent education on her own.

The interviewee feels that following traits are important for group leaders: (1) empathy (not necessary to be a parent, but necessary to be able to empathize with the problems associated with parenthood); (2) some understanding of and skill in group process; (3) some knowledge of child development and parenting concepts.

She feels that training in both group process and in parenting concepts are necessary. With regard to ethnicity, she feels that, ideally, a parent group should be mixed. If a whole group were, however, all Chicano, she feels it would be necessary under those circumstances for the group leader to also be Chicano (though not necessarily the co-leader).

HISTORY: The first course has just been completed. The course has no funding, per se, but is sponsored and administrated by the community school. Leaders would, she hopes, be paid at some point in the future, but funding sources are undetermined at present.

The program was desired by the Becker Community School, on the basis (probably) of a community needs assessment. PEA approached Becker in some way, she thinks, in an effort to link up people who had been trained as group facilitators to settings which had a need for such a program.

The program has been helped by the high interest of persons involved: Becker Community School leaders; Junior League; parent office, PEA; parents who know about it. Her own lack of experience, lack of program model, lack of visibility, no funding, are all factors which have hindered the program.

The interviewee hopes (and foresees) that the program will expand over the city. She hopes to precipitate this by getting a program going, training former participants as co-leaders and then as leaders, and then she, herself, moving on.

EVALUATION: The course was evaluated by the same instrument and method used for all community school classes. The instrument is a post-questionnaire completed by enrollees at the end of the program, asking about satisfaction, teacher rating, etc. The Becker coordinator has those forms. The interviewee does not know anything about data analysis, or results. She did talk informally with parents at the end of the course for feedback for future improvement.

REPLICABILITY: The course has a one-page written description. Another one is being developed for the purpose of public relations. The interviewee would be available for consultation and the parenting office would accept donations for such a service, though no formal fees may be charged.

HUSTON-TILLOTSON COLLEGE
PARENT FAMILY LIFE CENTER

IDENTIFICATION: The Parent Family Life Center is a new parenting program located on the Huston-Tillotson College campus. Its major objective is to teach basic parenting skills and to provide a place where parents can come to discuss and learn with each other child rearing principles and practices.

PARENT EDUCATION CONTENT: The Parent Education Program consists of two workshops per month which last from one and one half to two hours and home visitation in which volunteers assist parents, children, or other family members with a problem. The workshops cover topics such as child growth and development, nutrition and health education, and parent and adult education. Speakers from community agencies are utilized for the workshops.

CLIENTS: There are presently eight parents involved in the program with nineteen others who have been identified. There are no ethnic or income limitations on who can participate in the Center's activities; however, all of the present enrollees are Black and Mexican American. The parents participate in organizing the workshops.

STAFF: There are three staff members - two full time administrators, the parent coordinator and the administrative advisor, and one part-time secretary. All are Black. The two administrators have bachelor's degrees and backgrounds in teaching. An ability to relate to people and their needs was mentioned as an important trait one should possess in order to work in a setting of this type. Two college student volunteers act as home visitors.

HISTORY: The Parent Family Life Center began operation in January 1978. The aim is to assist parents, family members and other interested persons in helping children to grow and develop to their fullest extent. Therefore, a Parent/Family Life Center has been established. It is the purpose of PFLC to provide an atmosphere in which basic skills in parenting may be developed.

Seemingly, parents are ready and anxious to learn about child rearing practices and principles if they have the opportunity. The program consists of:

. Workshops - to develop parenting skills and recognize the value of participating in programs to help achieve maximum growth.

. Toy Lending Resource Library - to use activities in the home to enhance the the parents' and family's role.

. Referrals - To recommend clients and accept clients from community resources for assistance in assuming their role in developing a successful family life.

The efforts to assist parents and family members are geared toward coordinating the parenting program with existing agencies which are presently delivering services to or coordinating services for parents or families. Funding is through the United Methodist churches and ministries.

EVALUATION: The interviewee could not provide information. A client-satisfaction questionnaire has been administered to parents attending the workshops with positive results.

REPLICABILITY: The interviewee is available for consultation with other groups interested in organizing parenting courses. She is very strong in her belief that programs such as this are needed.

AUSTIN CHILD GUIDANCE CENTER
PARENT EDUCATION ACTIVITIES

IDENTIFICATION: This interview was with a therapist employed by the Austin Child Guidance Center. This agency conducts psychiatric activities with children and their families. It is a private non-profit service, with six funding sources including county, Austin A.I.S.D., Title XX, United Way, D.H.R., and fees. Special programs include child abuse victims and also sexual and incest abused children.

PARENT EDUCATION CONTENT: Parent Education activities include courses and workshops offered at various agencies (community schools, elementary schools) and also counseling with client families.

The format consists of 4 to 6 session "courses" that include limited lecture and mostly discussion with parents. ACGC staff act as leader facilitators. The last two courses involved 10 and 15 parents respectively and one with 12 couples (foster parents). They do not have a set curriculum, and content is determined by interests of parents attending. Some existing materials (SEDL booklets) and the facilitator's own notes are used. The courses took place at the host agencies facilities (community school). The need for these activities was determined by participants who requested this service from ACGC. The activities were judged successful by repeated attendance and by questionnaires filled out by participants. A week-end retreat was judged especially successful.

CLIENTS: Clients are referred to ACGC by schools and professionals. ACGC is one of three agencies that perform these services in Austin; half of their clients are poverty cases paid by Title XX money; the rest are charged a sliding scale fee.

Clients are representative of income and ethnic population of city; in groups are mostly mothers; they do not control who gets into each program; it is open to clients of sponsoring agency.

About 300 patients were processed by ACGC last year; in all cases a form of "counseling" parent education took place; the total volume of traditional parent education was restricted to attendance to classes mentioned before (10; 10; 12 or so plus a few one or two session presentations at elementary schools).

STAFF: Parent educator role is part of all staff; they see it as preventative mental health. In the specific activities, their role is as leaders/facilitators of group discussion sessions; as lecturers in straight presentations and as general resource persons. Professional roles are "Therapist" shared equally by psychologists and social workers except for one psychologist as a psychometrician (tester). Intensive and regular Staff Development Program consists of weekly sessions with all staff meeting with in-house or outside presenters dealing with all topics (not just parent education related topics). All ethnic backgrounds are represented although Anglos predominate. Equal split in gender.

HISTORY: Agency started as traditional psychiatric treatment agency. In 1975-76 it got more involved in Parent Education. After two years ACGC concluded that the needs of the community were being served by other agencies so they took a more passive role in Parent Education. It still does it by request but keeps the main thrust on treatment. This interviewee would like to see more Parent Education conceived as a preventative mental health activity rather than picking up the pieces for treatment after the fact.

Parent Education is seen in a continuium with therapy that involves different degrees of problems at different times but all directed to improve mental health.

Relative success or failure of specific program components is determined by a multitude of factors, including arrangements to take care of needs such as babysitting to facilitate attendance. The potential audience for programs is there but it has to be approached at the right time with the right format. The current ACGC philosophy is one of reacting to expressed needs and not pushing for any one program, although their professional opinion is that a lot of people could use some form of parent education and information.

EVALUATION: The evaluation activities have been informal and designed to improve the delivery of services, information, etc. Questionnaires have been used at the end of the workshops/courses asking about satisfaction, usefulness, etc. The information has not been written up in the form of reports.

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICE AGENCY
FAMILY LIFE ENRICHMENT PROGRAM

IDENTIFICATION: The interviewee is coordinator of the Family Life Enrichment Division (FLE) at the Child and Family Service Agency. The parent education is not a separate component, but is a group of activities within the FLE. The goals of the FLE are twofold: 1) prevention of family problems by strengthening family life through education and 2) advocacy, the identification of issues within the community impacting family life.

PARENT EDUCATION CONTENT: All FLE activities are educational; some are more specifically directed toward parents than others. These include:

1) Educational group series
   a) parent groups (6 weekly sessions, 1 1/2 hours each)
   b) parent-child communication series (parents and kids 10-17, 6 meetings)
2) Half-day parenting workshops (3 hrs.)
3) Training for parent educators (coordinated through Parent Education Association)
4) "Plays for Living" followed by discussion around parenting issues.
5) Case-aide whom she supervises has ongoing group of local recreation center (the agency also has family counseling services, diverse education groups, adoption service, program for teenage parents).

The interviewee does most of the direct parent training herself. Because of time limitations, the interview focused on activities 1a) and 2), which are the most frequent and most parent-education focused. Number 1b) was not discussed much because time did not permit.

The main goal of the program is to give some information or lesson on a given subject (topic sometimes chosen by her; sometimes according to selection of group). Topics are commonly centered around the area of communication; also a group often touches upon some Parent Education for

Teaching such as "I message, active listening;" transactional analysis such as persecuter-rescuer triangles; satire such as blamer-placater; role-playing usually plays an important role. A second goal is to always make the group fun. "Behavior change" is not a goal of hers. She feels that the main goal is information-seeking and receiving. Change is up to the individual. She guides the group according to her view of healthy family interaction, often helping participants to see what areas might need changing, but she does not push for change, per se. She feels each individual probably incorporates something useful according to his own needs, perceptions, and skills.

Groups meet at agency or in private homes for the series and range in number from 6 to 15; workshops range up to 20 and meet most often in churches. The interviewee sometimes works with a private psychologist, who works on a voluntary basis, and sometimes with UT social work students. She sometimes uses Parent Education for Teaching materials and has worked out her own handouts.

Success seems to depend on participants' enjoyment in participating and the leader's enjoyment and expertise in offering relevant information and addressing client needs. Most successful groups are those which have been formed on the basis of client requests and not comprised of people who are in trouble and need therapy more than education.

CLIENTS: Most groups and workshops are generated by request, usually evolving from former group or other contact work with an individual who recruits participants, or in conjunction with another activity or problem. It is difficult to recruit a group on one's own, to interest parents and get them committed when they are not in crisis. It has to be stimulated by

something related, by some need or interest of clients and not by perceptions of the "expert."

Clients are Anglo, middle-class, and usually parents of young children. Sometimes she has couples but more often has group comprised of mothers.

STAFF: The interviewee spends about 25% of her time in direct service; 15% in specific parent education activities; the remainder in tasks that are more administrative in nature. She is a white, middle-class female in her late 30's. She has a master's degree in social work, took a Parent Education for Teaching course, is a parent, participated herself in parent education groups, and worked previously in a psycho-educational clinic. She has trained with two Transactional Analysis-Gestalt Family Therapy professionals in Austin, and found it very valuable. The agency paid for the Parent Education for Teaching course.

She has found it valuable to be a parent herself in relating to parent problems, but does not feel that it is an absolutely necessary requirement. For her, personally, she does not try to teach things she herself cannot do. She also sees her approach to the family (i.e., family is a system, parents responsible for change within it) as more viable than another approach which lays blame on the children or is interested in changing the child. She feels another important personal characteristic is an attitude of acceptance of parents; that all parents have good intentions and do the best they can with the needs, knowledge and skills they have, and an attitude accepting that not all parents can or will change.

Training in working with groups is necessary. (For her, training and information about other ethnic and minority groups is necessary also, e.g., cultural differences and parenting attitudes.) Training in some approach

to parenting or methodology for parent-education (such as Gordon's, Ginoit) is necessary, but feels that it does not matter which methodology is selected. Practice in leading groups is also important.

HISTORY: The agency is a member of the national Family Service Association. All FSA agencies have a two-sided approach to family service: education and therapy. The Austin agency was begun in 1910 and funded by United Way. FLE charges some fees also. Current FLE operating budget is $28,240. Funding level has increased over time and will most likely increase somewhat more in the future.

The interviewee could not tell me anything about the evolution of parent-education activities within FLE from 1910 to the present, except to theorize that parent education probably came into stronger focus in the 50's and 60's. It is part of the whole middle-class ethic of "education" and "knowledge" as a means to improve life and solve problems. This ethic corresponds to her values. The growth of problems being faced by American families has helped promote and develop parent education efforts. The "Plays for Living" have helped the agency in general and FLE in particular because they have been very popular and well received. Mainly, a small staff has hindered program growth. In the future, FLE would like to focus more on family life cycles, including pre-marriage, divorce, and old age.

EVALUATION: No formal or specific parent-education evaluations have been done. Groups do, however, complete a post-questionnaire. The interviewee develops the form, administers them and looks at the responses qualitatively. Responses have been favorable.

REPLICABILITY: The interviewee gave me an agency booklet (attached). She would be available for consultation to anyone interested in doing similar

direct service work. She would be willing to answer any more questions FACS might have; found the interview to be thorough, but some questions difficult to be specific about due to the amorphous nature of the problem and variety of activities.

CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICE AGENCY
SERVICES FOR SCHOOL-AGED PARENTS

IDENTIFICATION: The interviewee coordinates a special outreach project for teenage parents with separate funds within the Child and Family Services Agency. She oversees two social workers who actually do the client contact work. The main purpose of the agency as a whole is to provide social services to families which are mainly educational or therapeutic in nature:

1) Individual, marriage, and family counseling
2) Family Life Enrichment Programs, including Plays for Living (education, prevention-oriented)
3) Groups, as requested by the community

PARENT EDUCATION CONTENT: The Services for School-Aged Parents Project is designed to reach low income teenage parents living in rural areas who need information and counseling but cannot (or do not) come into the agency. The services provided are usually on a one-to-one, individualized basis, the social worker visiting each client at home. The contact is both educational and therapeutic in nature, the two functions of solving existing problems and preventing new ones being intertwined according to the needs and readiness of the client to accept help and the progress of the client-social worker relationship. The usual contact consists as a home visit. Typically, initial contacts are mostly discussion, with the case worker teaching some kind of concrete skill according to the parental interests and capacities (e.g. diapering, bathing, feeding). Sometimes the social worker imparts more abstract information (e.g. child development norms). As the relationship between the client and social worker evolves and becomes more comfortable and trusting, discussion may become more counseling-oriented. The counseling sometimes includes the teenager's family - parents or husband or boyfriend. When geographically possible, clients sometimes meet as a group at a neighborhood center. These contacts are usually comprised of demonstration and group

discussion.

Common topics of interest to parents deal with discipline, feeding, bathing, bottle sterilization and health care. Social workers also attempt to introduce topics about and to encourage interest in cognitive stimulation and development. Goals of the contact, summarily, are to help the teenager become a better parent and to improve the parent-infant relationship.

Contacts are usually once a week or once every two weeks for (hopefully) up to one to two years. Duration of each visit varies and depends on the nature and content of the contact. Each case worker sees about 25 teenage parents.

Success of the contacts are monitored by individual case study progress reports. Kathy feels that within the framework of the many problems faced by each client and the limited goals for each client, the progress is satisfactory and the program successful.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD
PARENTS AS SEX EDUCATORS

IDENTIFICATION: Planned Parenthood is a non-profit family planning organization which has as its emphasis delivery of medical contraceptive services, family planning methods, and counseling on family planning and problem pregnancy.

PARENT EDUCATION CONTENT: Consists of a fifteen hour course entitled "Parents as Sex Educators." The course is offered in the form of a discussion group of 11 - 14 parents using exercises to increase conversation on topics such as ideas about sex, communication, factual information vs. myths about sex, values clarification, and parenting skills. Each meeting lasts two and one half hours and meets one evening per week for six weeks.

STAFF: Two staff members, the Executive Director and the Director of Education, are facilitators for the course. The descriptions of the two facilitators are as follows: There is one Director of Education, Anglo in his mid thirties with an M.A. in Education, with background experience as a trainer, he designed the program and has taught sex education courses for three years. His duties include direct discussions, registration, publicity, and follow-up. There is one Executive Director, who is Anglo is her mid thirties with a B.A. in Nursing, with background experience in sex education. Facilitators should be parents, good at relating with people, able to encourage people to explore issues, have a sense of humor, like to work with groups and have good communication skills.

CLIENTS: There are no guidelines or limitations on who may participate in the course. There is very little recruitment effort because of the large numbers of potential clients. Fifty per cent of the mothers attending the

workshops are single. 13/20 are mothers, 7/20 are fathers. Almost 100% of the participants are from middle income background and exclusively Anglo.

HISTORY: This program was established as a component of Planned Parenthood because of the rise of unwanted pregnancies, especially among teenagers. Numerous requests from individuals and social service agencies prompted the development of the education program for parents who, with the needed information, could be the best and most effective sex educators of their children.

EVALUATION: Groups taking the course are asked to evaluate the fifteen hours of instruction by completing a twenty-five item questionnaire. The areas covered include: effectiveness of facilitators, choice of techniques, facilities, what about the course was liked best, and change in feelings about talking about sex with one's children. The results are used informally. Facilitators meet with some group members for about one half hour to generally discuss the course and how it might be effecting the way parents communicate with their children about sex.

REPLICABILITY: One or both facilitators are available to consult with groups who might be interested in establishing a similar program.

TRAVIS COUNTY MH-MR
INFANT-PARENT TRAINING PROGRAM

IDENTIFICATION: The Infant-Parent Training Program serves children up to three years of age who have a delay in development. The agency provides diagnostic and evaluative services and designs individualized programs of instruction. In addition, the IPTP has both a home-based and center-based program for families who have children enrolled in the agency.

PARENT EDUCATION CONTENT: Consists of monthly parents' meetings focusing on child development, learning, language, and motor development; parent-child sessions in which teacher and parent work together with the child; and evening training sessions. There are also home visits made once a week lasting about one and a half hours each to families who cannot come to the center. Parents either in the center-based or home-based program are taught how to train their own children.

CLIENTS: Clients are referred to the program by other social service agencies. The only requirement for participation in the program is that the child be developmentally delayed. There is a large waiting list for entry into the program. The ethnic breakdown is 41% Anglo, 35% Spanish surnamed, and 22% Black. Seventy percent of the families served are below the poverty level.

STAFF: There are about fifteen full time people on the staff: 1 Director, 1 Curriculum Specialist, 1 Physical Therapist, 4 Consultant Therapists, 1 Therapeutic Program Supervisor, 1 Home Program Supervisor, 3 Classroom Teachers, 1 Classroom Aide, and 3 Home Program Teachers.

HISTORY: The program was started five years ago when the state switched to Plan A funding for special education. This meant that MH-MR would relinquish its contract services to children 3-21 to the Austin ISD. When this happened, MH-MR turned its attention to developmentally delayed children 0-3 who were

not being served with any type of program at that time. Hence, the Infant-Parent Training Program with heavy community support began operation with a $25,000 federal grant from HEW Bureau of Education for the Handicapped through the Developmental Disability Act.

EVALUATION: Evaluation of the parent education program is done through questionnaires that the IPTP has developed itself. Areas covered include parental attitudes, expectations, degree of knowledge about their child's problem, and skills needed to deal with the problem. A questionnaire is administered annually.

REPLICABILITY: Visitors are welcome to visit the program and the interviewee is available for consultation.

## AUSTIN ASSOCIATION FOR CHILDREN WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES

IDENTIFICATION: This interview was with the President of this volunteer non-profit organization. The Austin Association for Children with Learning Disabilities was established about ten years ago with the help of the Junior League by parents with children with learning disabilities who wanted an opportunity to exchange their ideas and concerns about their children.

PARENT EDUCATION CONTENT: The parent education content consists of monthly meetings and occasionally "rap sessions." The monthly meetings are attended by about 20% of the 120 members and last 1 - 2 hours. Guest speakers from community agencies, e.g., school district, MH/MR, School Board, are utilized to talk on topics of interest to the parents. Parents indicate their interests on a questionnaire administered at the beginning of each year.

The "rap sessions" are very informal in nature. The frequency of the sessions varies a great deal. About 5% of the membership turns out for the 1 - 1-1/2 hour sessions. The purpose of these meetings is mainly mutual support.

CLIENTS: The membership is composed of parents of children with learning disabilities. Most of the members (90%) are white middle class mothers. Recruitment is done mainly through the schools.

STAFF: A President and Board of Directors.

HISTORY: AACLD began about ten years ago by interested parents. The funding is about $1,200 per year and is collected through membership fees.

EVALUATION: Informally done by Board using turnout at monthly meetings, e.g., which ones have large turnouts vs. which ones have small turnouts.

REPLICABILITY: The interviewee is available to consult with anyone interested in starting a similar group.

## AUSTIN ASSOCIATION FOR RETARDED CITIZENS
## PARENT EDUCATION PROGRAM

IDENTIFICATION: The Austin Association for Retarded Citizens is an agency which focuses its efforts on general advocacy for mentally retarded children and adults. Parent and professional workshops, parent education, and support groups, youth volunteers, legislative activities, and public education are types of activities engaged in by the AARC.

PARENT EDUCATION CONTENT: AARC's parent education service takes the form of workshops/lectures/discussions for parents of mentally retarded children. Topics covered in the meetings are in the area of the rights of the mentally retarded child in terms of school programs, federal laws, and social service programs and diagnostic services that are available. The meetings last about two hours and are not regularly scheduled. Participation has ranged from a low of ten to a high of fifty. There have been three such meetings so far this year. The parents decide what topic they would like to discuss before each meeting. Guest speakers are utilized from time to time.

CLIENTS: Any parent of a mentally retarded child may partiicpate. The AARC uses the traditional forms of recruitment (media, referral, word of mouth, etc.) as well as the Special Education rolls of the school district.

STAFF: There are two individuals who are responsible for parent education: the executive director and the parent organizer/education director. Both hold MSSW's. Neither had any formal training or background in this field before being hired. There is no in-service training.

Knowledge of the problems of the mentally retarded and parents of mentally retarded children along with the ability to relate to people were cited as important characteristics for working in this agency.

HISTORY: The AARC was established in 1950 as the Austin Association for Retarded Children by a group of parents of mentally retarded children. It was basically a grass roots effort funded through private donations. Currently the operating budget is about $150,000. Funding sources are:

City of Austin and Travis County - 8%
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped through the Developmental Disabled Act - 20%
CETA - 20%
United Way - 20%
Title XX - 30%

It is anticipated that the funding and program will increase in the future.

EVALUATION: A questionnaire measuring satisfaction, learning, and soliciting ideas was administered to parents attending the workshops. The questionnaire was designed by the interviewee.

APCA
EFFECTIVE PARENTING WITH PRESCHOOL CHILDREN

IDENTIFICATION: The interviewee works for the Travis County Mental Health-Mental Rehabilitation Association in some capacity as educational writer. He became active in parent education at the request of the Austin Parent-Child Association (APCA) for someone from MH-MR to help them develop a newsletter. Through this contact, the need or the opportunity was seen for the development of a parent education curriculum. The interviewee and another employee of MH-MR wrote a parent education course manual and co-led some subsequent sessions together. After one year, MH-MR phased out its involvement with the APCA and the interviewee (and others) were asked to lead the sessions on their own time. The interviewee now teaches the course for APCA four to five times per year. With the Family Life Enrichment Coordinator of Child and Family Service Agency, he also teaches group facilitator skills for the MH-MR to laypersons who will then lead parent discussion groups in their local communities. In addition, he is an active member of the Parent Education Association.

We talked mainly about his work through the APCA. The course is called "Effective Parenting with Preschool Children." The APCA also works with parents through the La Leche League, Lamaze classes, Mother's Day Art Programs, and toy and book fairs.

PARENT EDUCATION CONTENT: The course is composed of an initial mini-lecture followed by group discussion. He also includes some films, games and exercises, and role-playing. The following topics are presented: interpretation of child behavior within the context of social and emotional

development; discipline, usually a preventative approach with some discussion of behavior modification; communication skills; problem solving; and relaxation and recreation as a parent.

The course lasts for six weeks: six weekly sessions of about two hours' duration. The maximum course enrollment has been fourteen. The average is around twelve. Most participants are couples of preschoolers, but he has had a number of single parents in attendance, also. He frequently uses a commercially available film, "The First Years Together," and the 60-70 page booklet (the manual he co-authored) which will soon be published. The sessions have taken place at the University School of Nursing on Red River. A new location with better parking access is being sought.

The need for this course evolved from the collaboration between APCA and MH-MR staff, initially about a newsletter.

The general course format is structured, but the specific content varies according to input from the parent clients. The interviewee has found the most effective procedural activity to be group discussion. Parents seem to value most the sharing of ideas, concerns, and solutions, and benefit most from a broader perspective (than one expert's) and richness of experience.

CLIENTS: The APCA advertises its parenting course through radio spots, the APCA newsletter, and ads in the newspaper. Participants also seem to find out by word-of-mouth. Anyone who wants to enroll may do so.

About 60% of the participating parents are mothers; about 75% are couples. Most (90%) are middle income and Anglo. All are English-speaking, with an occasional bilingual parent in attendance. Most are young (in their 20's) and the parents of young children (eight years or younger). Many are university students.

STAFF: The interviewee is an Anglo male in his late 20's, married, and the father of a five year old. He has a B.A. in liberal arts, and was originally hired by MH-MR as a technical writer for public information on education. The interviewee was trained, after a fashion, by working as a co-leader with a fellow employee, but the agency did not technically provide him any formal training for leading parent groups.

The interviewee feels that it is not necessary for a parent education leader to be a parent, but feels he must know something about children and what it is like to be a parent. He thinks that many of the qualities of a good parent educator are the same ones that would define a good therapist: being friendly, open, non-judgemental, able to think on one's feet; creating confidence, and a comfortable atmosphere; and posessing good communication skills.

Some qualities, he feels, are innate personality traits; other characteristics are subject to training. The leader should be knowledgeable about basic counseling techniques, group facilitation, and communication, and should have basic information relevant to child development and parenting. He should also be aware of other resources and support networks for parents.

Though it is not necessary to be the same age or same sex of the clients or to be a parent, it is important to be able to relate to the clients' cultural values. He thinks it is probably necessary to share the same ethnic background.

HISTORY: The program was begun two and one-half years ago, evolving out of another collaborative effort between the APCA and MH-MR. The interviewee does not know about the operating budget for the parent-education effort, but he does know that the APCA did receive a private grant from the Houston-based Cameron Foundation six months ago. Previously, the program has been

supported entirely by enrolees' fees ($22.50/couple). The interviewee receives compensation of $115 per course. He thinks that the APCA might be seeking out additional funding sources, but thinks that the supply (for classes) might already meet the demand. If the course were offered any more often, there might be difficulty obtaining adequate enrollment.

The origin of the program has been documented. Since its inception, the manual has be revised four or five times, and the sessions expanded from four to six. After some practice and experience, the interviewee has reallocated his time in focusing more on concrete information (such as specific behaviors, solutions, techniques) and less on abstract information. He also provides more time for discussion.

The program has grown and been given shape by the grant, MH-MR's support of him, support from the APCA, and by the interest areas of the parents. Hinderances are perhaps due to the fluctuating involvement and energies of the leaders. The interviewee believes that the program has reached a point of stability and will most likely continue much as it is now.

According to the interviewee, there is probably only moderate community support of the program, due to a number of factors. First, there is some skepticism and lack of information about what the program is about and lack of awareness of its existence.

Concurrently, there might be some stigma attached to attending this type of self-help group, which might be viewed as an admission of a problem.

EVALUATION: A questionnaire is administered at the termination of the course. Clients rate their satisfaction with various program elements in one section and rate program goals (change in parenting behaviors or view

of parent role) in another. The form was developed by course leaders with the aid of the MH-MR evaluation staff. The staff also analyzes results, which are reported to the interviewee, usually in the form of percentages and tallies. Results confirm verbal responses, and are summarily positive.

REPLICABILITY: The program has a poster. Interested parties are usually sent a copy of the manual. The interviewee is available for consultation at any time, and believes MH-MR might sponsor him in this kind of activity. Visitors are welcome to attend his course, but only if they come for all sessions.

The interviewee is available by telephone. He had no suggestions for improving the interview. He is willing to discuss the leadership training he does through MH-MR for lay-persons interested in leading parent groups.

MOTHERS, INC.

IDENTIFICATION: Mothers, Inc. is a private nonprofit group formed by the interviewee for women who value their role of mother. The organization is dedicated to raising the status of motherhood by organizing mothers and educating them in ways to change societal and cultural attitudes about motherhood.

PARENT EDUCATION CONTENT: This private non-profit group utilizes large (50-100 mothers) monthly meetings (2 hours in length) and small (15-20 mothers) neighborhood meetings (also 1 1/2 to 2 hours in length) as a means of providing parenting discussion forums for its members. Guest speakers are invited to join the groups in dialogues in each monthly meeting on various topics relating to the mother's role in society. Some of the purposes and objectives of Mothers, Inc. are:

- o To provide a support group for women with children.
- o To evaluate and better understand the role of the mother in society using creative programs and encouraging dialogue between parents and professionals on a multi-disciplinary level.
- o To promote the role of the family in society.
- o MOTHERS provides a forum for discussion of common concerns related to the psychological and creative growth of women with children.
- o MOTHERS places a high priority on home and family life and is dedicated to raising the status of motherhood by dealing with changing attitudes realistically and by challenging the myths of that institution.
- o MOTHERS believes in maintaining contact with current issues. This is reflected by the variety of topics presented and by inviting speakers from all walks of life.

CLIENTS: Mothers. No particular ethnic or income group is targeted; however, membership is almost 100% Anglo. Membership is approximately 300.

STAFF: There is no paid staff. This is a club with officers. Consultants

YWCA
PARENTING COURSE

The Parenting and Family Sex Education Workshops that were developed by the interviewee to be offered by the Austin YWCA were not successful. No one enrolled for either course. This failure can be attrituted to several factors. The interviewee feels, for instance, that the image of the YWCA is one of conservatism. Most programs sponsored by the YWCA are "safe" in that they are mostly exercise, music, dance, quilting, or art type classes. This conservative environment cultivated by the staff and membership may have been a contributing factor in the courses' failing to attract enrollees.

Another possible reason for the failure of the courses may be that the interviewee has no training in organizing or publicizing such programs. Her education and background are in linguistics.

The courses were not pushed and since they were new programs for this particular YWCA special emphasis on publicizing them might have made a difference.

The family sex education class would have been for 1 day per week, 2-1/2 hours, for one month. Planned Parenthood was scheduled to provide the consultants.

The parenting course was scheduled to be offered on alternate Mondays. The classes would have lasted an hour and a half and would have been continual in nature.

The client population was the YWCA membership. No active recruitment took place other than mailing out a brochure to YWCA members outlining the classes to be offered during the year. Expected enrollment was about 20 parents.

ST. IGNATIUS CHURCH
MOTHERS' CLUB

IDENTIFICATION: The interview took place at the home of the interviewee. The interviewee is program coordinator of a St. Ignatius Church-sponsored club for mothers. One morning per week, the members gather at the church for a social and enrichment program. Babysitting is provided. The aim of the club is self-improvement; one aspect of this goal is the betterment of oneself as a parent. Thus, some of the club's activities fall within the definition of "parent education." In our conversation, we attempted to extract these activities from the rest, and talk about them in isolation.

PARENT EDUCATION CONTENT: Club members meet at the church one morning per week for two hours during the school year; less often during the summer. Attendance ranges between 12 and 25.

Parent education topics are presented in the form of a lecture by a guest speaker, followed by group discussion. These topics occur about three times per year. The topics presented at the meetings are decided upon by the program coordinator, with some input from the members.

The interviewee recalled a session on the subject of child abuse, and one on discipline. She remembered the discipline session as being very successful, and felt its impact was due to the high interest in the topic by the members, combined with the dynamism of the speaker, who was a pediatrician.

CLIENTS: Mothers are recruited through the church bulletin and members are encouraged to bring friends. Anyone who hears about the program may attend. All participants are female; almost all are mothers; an occasional attendant is a grandmother, other relative or friend. Almost all have children 9 years of age or younger.

from various backgrounds, e.g., university professors, legislators, psychologists are utilized in the monthly discussion meetings.

HISTORY: Mothers, Inc. was established in 1976 by the interviewee. The rationale behind the group according to the interviewee has to do with the way society has looked upon motherhood. Traditionally mothers have stayed at home raising their children and enjoying the feeling of watching them grow. While an important full time "job," there is no training or recognition accorded for mothering as for other jobs. Consequently, because of this combination of responsibility and little societal recognition, some mothers can begin to feel isolated and overwhelmed, losing confidence in themselves. This is why Mothers, Inc. was formed. It is a place where mothers can meet, talk, and learn about mothering and other societal and cultural factors which interact with the role of mother and parent.

Members pay an annual membership fee of $12. Temporary members can pay $1.50 per monthly meeting.

Some of the topics covered thus far in the monthly meetings have been isolation, learning to listen and communicate effectively, political awareness of our rights as mothers, and choosing to be a mother.

EVALUATION: None

REPLICABILITY: The Austin group was the first Mothers, Inc. Since its inception a group in Brownsville has started and other chapters around the state will probably begin in the near future.

UNIVERSITY UNITED METHODIST CHURCH
DAY CARE CENTER

IDENTIFICATION: University United Methodist Church

PARENT EDUCATION CONTENT: Parents of children enrolled in the day care center volunteer for one morning every two weeks per child. The parents learn the principles of child development and how to teach their own children through classroom participation and modeling by the staff teachers.

CLIENTS: This is an open day care center not targeted at any particular group although there is an effort made to service the University community. Currently there are about twenty-five parents in the program.

STAFF: There are four staff people including the director. All are degreed in some aspect of child development and have training in early childhood. Important traits and characteristics staff should have include an ability to relate to both children and adults and an understanding of the needs of young children.

HISTORY: The day care program with the parent participation component was begun about ten years ago by the church's Board of Directors. In the beginning the program was initiated mainly as a service to be offered to University of Texas students. The current operating budget is about $1400 per month. The fee is $40 per month per child.

EVALUATION: None done nor anticipated.

REPLICABILITY: The director did not know of any other day care centers in the Austin area with a similar program.

STAFF: The position of coordinator is voluntary. The interviewee selects and makes arrangements for the guest speakers. She feels it important for the speakers to be honest and direct in their presentations.

HISTORY: The program was begun three years earlier. The only funds are from a twice yearly bakesale and by mothers' contributions to the "pot." This money pays for babysitting.

She believes the program was begun because a need was perceived within the church for sharing among the members. Originally, a day-out program was begun. The educational component evolved out of a need for more in-depth and serious contact than simply socializing.

The program has been hindered at times by apathy. The interviewee sees a potential for growth. The program plans to expand to two directors, plus an idea committee. The mothers who have participated are very, very enthusiastic. The interviewee feels this is due to their need for general personal growth, both socially and educationally.

EVALUATION: She has personally talked with much of the membership about their satisfactions with the program and ideas for improvement. They want more guest speakers in the future. She asked me to put her in touch with any parent educators who might be willing to be a guest speaker at the church.

REPLICABILITY: The program has no written description. She would be willing to talk with anyone interested in setting up a similar program and visitors are welcome at any time. She is available by telephone for future contact. She had no suggestions for improving the interview.

PARENTING OFFICE

The interviewee is the Parenting Office Coordinator, which is a half-time position proposed by the Junior League and recently funded by the Hogg Foundation (two months ago). She is the only employee of the Parenting Office and is housed at the Child and Family Service, 419 W. 6th St., which is where this interview took place. In essence, the interviewee works for the Parent Education Association (PEA), her role being to develop a support and communications network for parent educators and to coordinate their efforts. She also helps link PEA-trained group facilitators with groups or organizations needing some form of parent education.

To carry out her functions, she is conducting an informal survey of local parent educators and parent education programs. The chairperson of the PEA who works with the interviewee also attended the interview.

The interviewee identified a number of key parent educators and programs, some of which were interviewed.

An interesting fact about the origins of a number of parent education efforts came to light during the discussion. Historically, the Junior League had been active in leading parent discussion groups prior to the birth of the PEA. When the PEA was formed, a member who had recently moved from Phoenix provided input about similar parent discussion groups which had been ongoing in Phoenix for many years. These groups, however, were led by parents themselves who had had some training in group process, rather than by education experts. These groups, developed according to the philosophy that parents learn more and derive more support from each other than from experts and more from discussion than from didactic methods, were highly successful. Based on the Phoenix model (a copy of which I believe may be available from the interviewee) the PEA undertook the training of parents and lay-persons in

group facilitation. This training is ongoing. Leaders are encouraged to return to their local communities to lead parent discussion groups (usually through their local community school). One leader, who is not herself a parent, was trained in this fashion, and has co-led a group at Becker Community School. An interview with this leader about her function as a parent discussion group leader followed this interview.

APPENDIX E

Sample Interview Transcript

SAMPLE INTERVIEW TRANSCRIPT:
BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

AM: First of all, let me clarify for myself, what is your exact title?

I: I am the Parental Involvement Specialist for the Title VII Bilingual Program

AM: The Bilingual Program is a part of a larger umbrella agency?

I: Its part of the total department of Bilingual Education, which is part of a total division, which is part of the total district.

AM: What is the correct address here?

I: 6101 Dillard Circle

AM: Does the Parent Involvement Component have a special name or particular . .

I: It is the Parental Involvement Component and it is one of 4 components that are Title VII Bilingual Program.

AM: What are the names of the others?

I: There is the Instructional Program, Human Development and Staff Development.

AM: What in general are the activities of the Parental Involvement Program?

I: In general the main objective, I guess you could say our goal, for this component is to bring an awareness to the parent of the educational process of their children and try to get different degrees of involvement.

AM: What specific kinds of activities then do you use to reach you goals?

I: There is a number of things and that is the reason that I brought this out because we do, its at several levels, ok. We do in-school kinds of activities and these are mostly workshops that deal with _____ materials making to tutoring _____ to parenting sessions at the school and then we also have a program in which we go into the home of the parent and its the Home Intervention Program that is tied into the curriculum that we use. We, in Title VII, are a research project and we are testing some methods of instruction and the Parental Involvement Component has tied into that and we have developed some parent kits that go along with the curriculum and we are working with a limited number of parents in trying to determine if home intervention, you know reinforcement of school classroom activities, in the home, shows an increase in the child's learning.

AM: So the home visit part of it is the one that uses this curriculum and . . .

I: But now that is only a part of the home activities part that we do. I work with 9 community representatives, these are people that are paid out of the program funds, that are based at the school, and part of their duty is to make home visits ongoing throughout the year and bring all kinds of information from the school to the home and visa versa. And also to assist parents who need assistance in referring them to several social agencies, etc.

AM: So essentially there are 2 parts to the home program itself - the in classroom activities and then the parenting discussion groups?

I: Yea, we do have the parenting sessions too.

AM: Let me ask you some specific questions about each one of those components. _____ home visits into 2 components so I can keep them straight. Do you have a specific name for the curriculum one?

I: We call it the Home Intervention Program and its based on the curriculum that we call EBC, Experience Based Curriculum.

AM: Is that commercially developed, or did you develop it?

I: No, its developed by us here.

AM: In the intervention program curriculum, how many times would it occur?

I: We are working with 148 parents in the total design, 74 of which were receiving weekly home visits at least. Sometimes, depending on how the parents are working with the materials and everything, sometimes we wouldn't have to do anything else but take the units and explain to the parents and then check with them at the end of the unit.

AM: So its basically, you do it yourself, the package itself is self-explanatory.

I: Right, we do some formal training at the beginning of it with the parent groups and then I train the community reps. to explain the materials to the parent and then also brought in some parents, you know, working at 2 grade levels, primary and intermediate. So we have 2 groups of parents that receive the training and with the community reps. and then they follow through with the home visits in giving additional information to the parents.

AM: OK, now the community reps. are the ones who made the visits?

I: Yea, they made the home visits. Initially I made some visits with them. OK, to make sure that they were kind of on the right track and everything like that but then they did most of it on their own.

AM: How long would one of the home visits last?

I: I would assume that here again it would depend, I would hate to give it a fixed time, I would assume that anywhere from 20 minutes to possibly 40.

AM: About how many sessions would there be, in terms of weeks or months?

I: There were 4 units and the program was implemented in October through January, so we figure 1 a week for that length of time.

AM: And thats about how long it takes for the parent to go through the cycle of the 4 components?

I: Right - the 4 units.

AM: Could you briefly describe, sort of, the content of it?

I: Each of the units is based on, and I'm describing the units used in the classroom, the children are given, there is a list of vocabulary and the premise of the units is that children can learn the vocabulary in certain concepts within the unit providing that they are given experiences in the classroom and out of the classroom. In some of the units they culminated with a field trip in which they did pre and post type of activities in the classroom and so we wrote the units to be used by the parents based on that curriculum. Parents got a list of the vocabulary, they received suggested activities - most of them were very simple kinds of things that it was just mostly encourage them to interact with their children, to ask questions about what they were doing in school and to praise and to encourage their children to talk about what they had been doing. They knew the vocabulary so that they could interject some of those words. We also provided for the parents graphs, pictures, books, posters that went along with each of the units and we gave them suggestions as to how to use them. The posters they were able to put on the walls and to keep.

AM: So these did take place at the home?

I: Right

AM: How did you determine the need for this?

I: It was in the original application that we made and it was through test scores and the identification of the children that are limited English speaking ability children and they are all parents of children that are in our program so that the need was established through the children.

AM: Now I'd like to talk a little bit about the other aspect of the home visit, now that is more service oriented would you say, or . . .

I: Well, its not only that, there are so many facets to it, its an effort on the part of the school to increase the communication between home and school. Many times its just a matter of going and giving information to the parents and alot of times its bringing information from the home to the school to assist the teachers and the principal in working with the children. They make a home visit initially and they find out what is happening in the family, they bring information to the teachers that will help them. If they see at that time that the parent is needing some assistance then we refer them to different social agencies or referring them sometimes to resource people in the school, like a nurse or the visiting teacher - we get assistance to them that way. Also, a lot of times, when children are having problems in the classroom, in various areas, like if they are having trouble, with say, in certain concepts of math, teachers can let community reps know what is going on. Community reps

we have at each of the schools a lending library that has a lot of materials and books and games and toys - they can pick up certain things and use that. That is also done - that is aside from the social agency bit.

AM: So the community reps - are these the same people who are involved in both parts of this - in both administering and working with the parents on the curriculum and . . .

I: Right, exactly.

AM: So, the goals for that then would be what?

I: Again, the general goal, and we have very general goals. I think we had 2 specific objectives that were measured and we can go into those in a minute if you would like. But our overall goal is just to involve parents and to increase their awareness in the educational process of their children and that covers a lot of territory - its very general. And it also carries the thing of trying to enhance the child's self-image by involving his parents in the school and making his parents aware of everything that is going on at the school.

AM: Yea, well I definitely want to ask you about the evaluation later on in the interview. The home/school part of the home visit program, is there a specific number of times that a visit would be made by a community rep or . .

I: There is no, we don't give them any structure like say, you have to visit each family so many times out of the year because we have a large number of children in our project - there are well over 3,000. Some parents need a lot of assistance and others not as much, so we encourage community reps to try to visit every home at least once during the year.

AM: What would you say is sort of the range of number of visits . .

I: Some _____ reports that I did and daily logs of community reps keep, I would say that on the average they make about anywhere from 10 to 15 home visits per week.

AM: And about how many would that be per family?

I: Gee whiz, I would hate to even venture a guess there. I'm sure that there are some families that they visit very regularly. Those parents in our EBC design, for instance, were visited very regularly. Another thing that kind of shoots off of all of this is that inevitably community reps are responsible for trying to check on attendance, you know, if children are absence a great deal of the time, they inevitably make home visits to try to get to the bottom of the problem.

AM: Would 1 community rep work with the same family or is there some, in other words, would 1 community rep be particularly interested in one child or several children, would one child have more than one community rep?

I: I see what you are saying, I think I see what you are saying. On some campuses there are 2 community reps. Is that what you mean? There is a Title I community rep, there is Title VII community reps. Some children even have a migrant community rep, if they happen to fit into that category. So, yes, I would venture to say that some children probably do receive services of more than one.

AM: Right, in the case of the home curriculum, would the same community rep visit the same family every time?

I: Yes

AM: Now these visits would take place primarily in the home. And would the need for this activity determine the different way from the home intervention program or is it . . .

I: What activity?

AM: For the services . . .

I: Its basically the same need that these are children - they are limited in English speaking ability and they need assistance, parents, they are usually in the low socio-economic group and they need assistance and so that is the overall need, there were no specific areas identified in terms of need to determine what kinds of home visit would be made, etc.

AM: In the case of say an individual parent who had a need, how would that be determined, in other words how would a community rep - do they approach all the parents or does the parent refer . . .

I: A lot of times referrals are made by teachers, and counselors and principals. There is a procedure that is followed - a child is referred to the community rep and she makes a home visit to follow up on it.

AM: And that would be sort of the primary way that a child would be identified or that contact would be made by the community rep.

I: No, the children are identified initially by the administration of a language dominance test. And that is how we came up with the number of children we work with. They are given a language dominance test to determine their . . .

AM: So, all the children as a result of that test are a part of your program.

I: Yes, all of the children that fit into a certain category.

AM: And all of the children of that program and their families would be in contact then with a community rep.

I: Exactly.

AM: Now I'd like to talk a little bit about the parenting sessions - what kind of content does that have?

I: OK. Initially when we started the parenting sessions, and this has been in operation for 4 years - this is our 4th year - its the 3rd year of a 5 year grant. There is a need for, we foresaw a need for it in that, you know, everybody can benefit from positive parenting skills. And since our effort was to help the children we knew that the parents needed help also. And so initially we hired a consultant from out of the district that was familiar with PET and he provided the training for two clusters of parents - one in the fall and one in the spring of about 25 parents each time. They attended 5 days total - one day a week. He did the training in English and in Spanish. I searched high and low for a good consultant - I think we got a good one. The following year our funds were cut back, we did the training again with the same consultant but he cut it back to a 2 day session - you know compressed it into a shorter period of time. And the following year, and all this time incidently I had become aware of some good parenting materials that were availabe different places and we purchased some of them, even the Southwest Lab as a matter of fact, The Early Childhood Department and purchased 3 of their kits - Disciplining the Young Child is one of them, Living and Learning in the Home and the 3rd one was on Developing Independence and Responsibility in both English and Spanish. We purchased them and so the following year I provided the training using, in fact, we piloted the materials for the Lab one sememster and then the following semester we gave it without all of the evaluation that you have to do for the pilot and we've done it again this year. Using those materials. Now this year I guess the more familiar that I become with the materials, the more that I have been able to adapt them to different groups and so what we have done, we've clustered schools so that we have a total of 3 clusters in which we provide 3 sessions, about 2 hours long, on consecutive weeks, and I've been able to adapt other materials into it. We use basically the materials provided by the Lab but I've also used film strips from parents magazines, little booklets that I've picked up from here and there and you find a better hodge podge now and I have found that to be most effective. And a lot of the times parents will themselves tell us what types of - like we get started and they'll say, yea well all of this is with the early childhood and I've got teenage kids that we need some help with, so I'll scrounge around and we'll get some materials and we try to address those needs so that we try to _____ our sessions to fit the needs of what parents say what it is that they need.

AM: So how long would a single parent participate in this?

I: OK, a parent would receive training for approximately anywhere from 6 to 8 hours.

AM: And that would be say 3 sessions of about 2 hours each. You are the primary person who is conducting these programs?

I: I do the training most of the time, now, I do have some community reps who have received - we went to the Lab, received training on those kits, and they have been through it so much that they have become really good at it and on occasion when I have been unable to make a session or I feel very comfortable sometimes saying, hey I need to be over here, take over and some of them have gotten very good at conducting those sessions.

AM: How many times would you say you've done this in the last year?

I: OK, how many sessions have I done?

AM: Not, well, if there is a total of say 6 hours of the 3 sessions, how many times have you done that 3 sessions cycle?

I: OK, we've used different kits at each of the schools so I'm going to count those as being different ones - about 6 times.

AM: About how many parents would participate in each session?

I: We try to limit our groups to about 12 to 15 people, simply because the smaller the group, the more interaction you can get and the more successful that they are. But remember we cluster our groups so that we have, we wind up with, I have sometimes 3 I'm doing like 3 different topics at 3 different sites and working with a total of 45 parents at a given period of time.

AM: So the clustering is based on content.

I: The clustering is based not only on content but on the location of schools.

AM: So you might have several going on at once. How many of these would you figure you do in a whole year?

I: In a whole year I do approximately, oh I'd say about 12, different sessions. By session I mean the total program.

AM: That would be administered how many times each, do you think?

I: I'm not sure I understand your question.

AM: OK, you have the different clusters, the different topics, and there is a cycle of say 3 meetings for each one, how many times would that particular topic and cycle be repeated?

I: Oh, probably twice. Probably more than that because at some sites we go with the Spanish version and we may be doing the same version in English at another site, so probably more than twice. I don't know I'd have to go back and check.

AM: Let me see if I've got it straight. There are approximately 12, there are 12 different units _____, of the different topics is that what you said?

I: 12 units

AM: There are 12 clusters? No. Each series of 3 would be a single topic. How many different topics are there?

I: OK, I have, topics that I suggest are those that I have readily available so I have probably about 4 topics that I work with. But remember each of these topics, when we are talking about independence and responsibility and when we are talking about discipline in the early child, even though your focusing on one thing, the same basic premise prevades all of this and that is - positive parenting skills and so that would be the general topic and that is why they are called parenting training sessions.

AM: The number of times any one of these parenting sessions, the 3 sessions, would occur in the city, that someone could go to, in a year?

I: I see, probably twice a year, once in the fall and once in the spring.

AM: Now there was another aspect that you mentioned which is the workshops. Can you talk a little bit about those?

I: That goes along with one of our objectives and one of the things that we have tried to do is to get parents to actually come into the classroom and assist in the instructional program model. And so, initially at the beginning of the year we had some training sessions with parents - we identified those teachers that wanted to have volunteers in the classroom and then we identified those parents that could assist us. And so we provided training to those parents.

AM: What was the criteria for identifying the parents?

I: We just asked parents, how many of you are free to assist in the classroom and what are some of the things you think you would like to do, and at what grade level would you like to do it and, you know, it was just real questionnaires, sometimes it was not necessarily a written questionnaire, although we have used them in the past, sometimes it was just a verbal kind of questionnaire. And once those volunteers were identified, we provided 6 hours of training to those parents and in some instances teachers prefer to do their own training because it was more specific. Now the type of training that I provided to those parents was kind of general, in the area of reading, what are some things that you can do to assist a child who is having difficulty in reading and it had to do with using certain techniques, and questioning techniques and some very simple games, initial sounds and _____ sounds and all that kind of things. And then we did the same thing for mathematics and then we did another one on culture.

AM: So, how many workshops did you say there were?

I: There were a total of 3.

AM: For each single parent. And how long would the workshop last?

I: They varied again here - I think that we met from 9:00 to 12:00, so they were about 3 hour sessions.

AM: And about how many parents in each workshop?

I: Again here it is the clustering, because that made it easier for me to be able to provide the training because I work out of 10 campuses and so it clustered and at each session we probably had anywhere from 12 to 15.

AM: Where did the workshops themselves take place?

I: They took place at the different schools.

AM: Once the parent had gone through the workshops series then he or she became involved in the classroom, daily or . . .

I: Again this was a schedule decided by the teacher and the parent. Once the parent and the teacher got together they decided. Some of them came on a very regular basis, some of them came 2 or 3 times a week, some of them came once a week, some of them came only - some teachers requested the parents _____ only when they were doing cultural units. So they would be contacted when there was a cultural unit being done and they came in and assisted then. So it varied from school to school and from classroom to classroom.

AM: Would the volunteer time last for a semester or a year or . . .

I: Again here this was left up to the individual teacher and the parents.

AM: In the classroom, the activities of the parents participating in what kind of range did they have?

I: Well, they went from tutoring on a one to one basis to tutoring with a small group of children. And sometimes it included _____ kinds of demonstrations of the whole class.

AM: As far as the activities, is there anything I haven't asked you that you would like to say about the activities? I have a couple of general questions that sort of apply to all the activities, some of which I think you've already talked a little bit about. I think you mentioned particularly in the parent discussions that the parents were in some cases involved in determining the types of activities. Is that true in any of the other activities? The workshops or the curriculum . . .

I: They had a choice in terms of _____ and things that teachers need assistance with, which of these things do you feel comfortable about, so in terms of that they were able and in terms of the grade level. Some of them said well, we'd rather work with full grown children and some of them said well, I'll work with the younger ones. So that they had a choice in that.

AM: How about the curriculum, the home curriculum?

I: No, they had no choice in that. Since it was based on the curriculum that was written for the teachers and the students, we had to go with that.

AM: In your opinion are any of these activities particularly successful?

I: That is something that is very difficult to measure, as you know. In terms of, in one way that we can measure it is by the numbers of parents that participate in the school in any capacity. The numbers of parents that have been coming to the schools since our project started have doubled and tripled and so I think that the component objectives have been successful but I wouldn't be able to tell you in what particular area. Sometimes we talk to parents and in talking to them they make comments like - I didn't realize my child knew so many words. Like the other day one of our units was on bridges and a parent was telling us that they were crossing a bridge and that their kid started pointing out all the different parts of the bridge and so, you see that type of thing is not measured in terms of numbers or anything but we feel that it has been successful to some degree.

AM: That is one of the kinds of things that we are interested in looking at is those sort of unmeasurables that lead to success. Do you think its sort of all 4 of the activities or the classroom components . . .

I: We'll know for sure how effective it has been because we have a very strong and vital evaluation component in our district, housed separately from us and children receive, all of the kids in our project, receive a post test, a pre test you know on the EBC. Its a test developed specifically to measure the learning on the EBC curriculum and then they are given the post test and their achievement is measured. Those children that were in the home intervention program are going to be compared with others that were not so that as soon as that analysis is done, we'll know if there was any significant increase in their achievement. We also interview parents, all of the parents that were in the EBC research design were interviewed to measure a lot of things, like their attitude about bilingual education, their knowledge of who is working with their children, teacher's names, aides' names, principal's names, I think there is a series of about 12 questions. One of the questions was also on the EBC on how many units they received, they had to identify the units by name, and then a question was asked whether they worked with their children in English or in Spanish and so as soon as those interviews were just completed last week, and evaluation is withholding on the analysis until they got all of the interviews in so I should have more information for you on that within the next couple of weeks. We're hoping that it did make a difference. The children in our parental involvement design were randomly selected . . .

AM: In the actual evaluation you mean? So within that group of 3,000 children randomly children were selected to be evaluated?

I: No, all of the children were evaluated. But for the home intervention design 148 children were randomly selected. We worked half of those with a control group and the other half was the treatment group - they were the ones that received the EBC materials and so since they were randomly selected we wound up with a suprisingly high number of parents that were willing to work. About half of our parents are working parents so they are not available to us during the day. But suprisingly a pretty good percentage of them decided that they could work with the children. Some of them from the onset said no, I don't have time, it is not my bag, etc. But those numbers were small. We had a

couple of students that transferred out or dropped out and we had some parents that received the units but we could tell that their enthusiasm wasn't there so that we were working with a lot of variables. We had some parents that were not very literate - they couldn't take the written material and work with their children, specifically they couldn't, so we had to do everything verbal with them and we don't know exactly how successful that was going to be so we had varying degrees of educational levels and literacy and attitudes that we have to contend with because it was a random selection and we wanted to keep it that way because we feel that the results and those variables are a natural condition in the Austin schools that we need to know about so we can know exactly what to do. It would have been so much easier to hand pick the parents that we wanted to work with but that would not have given us a true picture.

AM: What was done with the control?

I: Nothing. Those kids received the units and worked with their teachers but the parents did not know about it, they were not encouraged to go on the field trips, they did not work with their kids. Some of them might have anyway, you know, but we did not make an effort with those parents.

AM: Right, so all of the children in both the control and the test group will have a pre and a post test?

I: Right

AM: And the parents will then also fill out, you interview the parents?

I: All of the parents fill out an interview.

AM: What kinds of questions, in general?

I: This is a memo that I just recently wrote on the EBC design with all of the copies of the agendas for the training and everything on here and this is a copy of the questionnaire that was administered in English and Spanish.

AM: What kinds of questions did you ask the parents in the interviews?

I: They are all in here. What is the teacher's name? Principal's name? Do you check to see if your son or daughter has any homework? Do you make sure they do it? And then they can can check off - sometimes, seldom, never. How often do you discuss your child's schoolwork with him? Do you discuss with other parents the things happening at school? How many times have you visited the school since August, 1977? Do you discuss your child's report cards with him? How well do you feel you understand bilingual education? How much do you approve of bilingual education for your child? Prior to today has the school informed you of the bilingual program and what it's doing? Which parents work during the day? This is for our own information. And then this last question for parents given the Experienced Based Curriculum, check the ones received, the ones used in English and the ones used in Spanish. There were 6 total and they got 4 of the 6.

AM: So out of these 6 there would have been 4. OK. Who did the . . .

I: The community representatives

AM: And who administered the test to the children?

I: Testers from the Office of Research and Evaluation.

AM: What is going to happen to these results . . .

I: Last year our results were really good, those children really achieved, the gains were significantly higher - those that were in the treatment group. We've already gotten wind that this year's results are also pretty good. And so this is, all of the Title VII programs are research programs and the efforts that, they are learning something here that can be duplicated and used in other parts of the country so that if our curriculum is found to be indeed something that children can learn from and do achieve on it, and incidently these children that are in the, well also their CAT scores and their [illegible] scores will be compared, the treatment and non-treatment group to see if there is also an increase in that area. That was done last year also and I don't know what the results of those were. We do have the evaluation reports available for your review, if you would like. And so

AM: Were any evaluations done on any of the other parenting programs? Informal or formal?

I: No, initially we did evaluate them informally, they had to fill out a thing when we were doing the pilot test with the Lab. That turns off a lot of our parents because it makes them very nervous to have to sit and check and read. Some of em cannot read well and cannot write well and it turned em off, I could feel their discomfort and so rather than do that, I, we do a lot of oral type evaluations, like at the end of every session you can tell by the way people are reacting whether their accepting it or not and whether they feel like . . A lot of times parents, after they have finished one session, will request another one and that is always a good sign. And so there is no formal evaluation being done on the parenting sessions like that.

AM: How about the workshops and the classroom activities?

I: The only way we have of doing that is by determining the number of parent volunteers that are coming into the classroom and the number of times that they come. Remember I told you that we had 2 objectives that were being measured on the evaluation. One of our objectives is that we would train a corps of 4 parent volunteers minimum per school and that they would come and assist the teacher in the classroom a minimum of, I can't remember if it was 4 or 5 times during the year. We have trained a much larger number than that and community reps keep a running chart on when they come, how many times they come and indications have shown that we have really surpassed that objective. And here again it depends on the teacher and the parent. We have some parents that have come as many as 3 times a week for the past several months and then we have some that just barely met the objective, maybe they have come only 3 or 4 or 5 times, but in all cases the number of corps volunteers exceeded the minimum 4.

AM: What is the range on that?

I: I would say that on the average, we probably had 6 volunteers per school that came a minimum of 5 times during the year, ok that is an average figure. Now the other objective was that we would try to increase the number of parent visitors into the classroom - not just to do the instructional part, that was one objective, but keep track of how many parents were participating in the district and we did have an increase. 1975-76 there were a total of 2,035 parent contacts - these are recorded by the teachers and turned in . .

AM: And these are sort of the informal visits?

I: Right. It also includes the people that are actually volunteering with the instructional program. It includes all parents that teachers come in contact with in the classroom. In 1976-77 that increased to 5,407 by January, by November of this year we had 3,974.

AM: So that is only the first 3 months.

I: And so this indicates either parents are coming more to the schools or teachers are keeping better track of whose coming. We like to think that it is the other because really the number of parents coming into the schools has increased tremendously. Its obvious to principals and to teachers that we talk to.

AM: Is there any other evaluation activity that I haven't asked you about?

I: I think that pretty well covers it.

AM: We are interested in how parents are recruited and you said that it was based on children taking a language dominance test.

I: Now they were not recruited that way - parents were identified the same way the children were. Those children that fit in certain categories in terms of language performance, language dominance were in our program. And their parents automatically became parents that could participate in the program. We are limited to serve the parents of those children that we work with according to our guidelines and so out of those parents then in the course of making home visits, kindergarten registration, you know, effort was made by the community rep to recruit them and to get them to come and to assist in all of the activities that I described and so they were recruited in that way.

AM: Primarily by the community reps . . . so this would be personal contacts?

I: Personal contact and also telephone contact in some instances but most of our, well, I would venture to say that 90% of our parent volunteers came about through personal contact.

AM: Now from one of the activities I think you mentioned something about referral, is that used to recruit parents?

I: Sometimes it happens that way, its not the intent of a referral to recruit a parent to come but sometimes it does happen. A community rep is making a home visit for something else and she finds a person that is very interested, very responsive and, you know, sure you recruit them, you try to get everybody you can. One of the things that has happened when we recruit parents and if they become very involved inevitably they get a position at one of the schools as a teacher aide or as a community rep and you wind up having to start from scratch again. We recruit parents anytime that we can and at any opportunity.

AM: Now for the curriculum, that was a random selection?

I: Right

AM: Is there any media campaign involved?

I: That is one of our areas of weakness. The only kind of media campaign that we have going are the newsletters. Every single parent in our program receives in the mail one of these twice a year. It gives them information, notices, newsletters that community reps prepare at the local level also _____ by way of the kids, inviting them to meetings, telling them about whats happening at school, and that.

AM: So these would be sort of school based?

I: Yea. This one comes directly out of our office. On occasion for important meetings, I've used press releases and radio stations, particularly KMXX, the Mexican-American radio station. I don't do that consistently and that is an area of weakness. I don't feel that we have made a real strong effort to capitalize on the media to let the total community know what is going on in bilingual education. The 1st year that we were in operation I got the Herald to do a full page on our program and that is disseminated to all portions of the community but it hasn't been repeated since then and I feel that this is an area we really need to work on.

AM: How about word of mouth?

I: Yea, well, that happens, anytime community reps are making home visits or when we have these workshops and you bring parents together, you know . . .

AM: Now the, I'm interested in the sort of different percentage of people who are actually attending the different parts of your program, how many would be mothers?

I: A big percent, we have a few fathers. These are based on classroom participation sheets that we collected last year. It gives you the total number of parents that came to all of the schools and the different categories.

AM: Let me just read this then. There are 1,359 mothers, 176 fathers, and 78 others, primarily kin. How about family or couples, is that . .

I: Not too often. On occasion, we'll have couples that will come to the parenting sessions but more often then not its the mothers.

AM: What is the approximate percentage of low income parents involved in the program?

I: 100%

AM: The percentage of Mexican-Americans?

I: I would say that it is anywhere from, I would venture to say that it is between, its close to 90%.

AM: OK, what is the other 10%?

I: We have some Anglo children in our program at our Baker, South Austin schools and we have a percentage of Blacks from Allison and up there, in the valley primarily. I wouldn't even venture to guess on those percentages. I don't know if that kind of comparison has ever been made in our project.

AM: The percent of bilingual parents?

I: I would venture to say that bilingual parents - a good 75% to 90%, again here I am taking a wild guess because I don't know if we've actually sat and done that type of study.

AM: Ok, how about Spanish language parents?

I: We have probably around maybe 30%.

AM: How about English language parents?

I: 10%

AM: What percent of the parents are parents of infants?

I: You know we have all that information that was done from that parent questionnaire because that was one year that we included that question because we wanted to know how many of them had small children and, therefore would not be able to assist in one of our functions unless we provided babysitting for them. Golly, that's a tough one. I would say that a good at least 60% of them would have preschool children at home.

AM: And then 100% school age. How about teenagers?

I: I would go with 60% again, maybe even more, I just don't know.

AM: What is the total number of parents that would be involved in the total parent involvement program in any given year.

I: As many parents as we have students. Now we are talking about, not all of them get involved, your talking about the ones that actually get involved. I would say a good 40% to 50%. When we say involved, again here I question that because we're talking about involvement in actual inschool activities that our program provides or the home visits. That is probably more limited. But when we're talking about involvement in other capacities, like coming for conferences, like coming to school functions, like assisting

in many different ways that we don't even measure, the percentage would be much higher.

AM: But about at any given time, about the number, how many people would be involved in these specific activities that we've talked about, a rough approximation.

I: I think 40% to 50%

AM: I'd like to ask you a little bit about the different staff roles, the people that would be involved in the various activities. Who else would be involved directly in contacting and working with the parents?

I: I work with them directly. On occasion, my coordinator works with them. Also, different members of the instructional staff, teachers and supervisors that we have up here - they have conducted workshops for us and they have assisted in the training of the teachers to some degree. Our counselors at the school sites - they are not Title VII counselors but they work directly with the parents, some of them more than others.

AM: Lets talk about the community representatives first. About their exact title. How many are there?

I: In our program there are 9.

AM: What percentage of the community reps time is devoted to working in the parent activities?

I: All of them, 100%. They are involved in other activities - their work is not 100% time devoted to just working with parents. As their coordinator, as their supervisor, I'm a support person to the schools - they come under the total jurisdiction of the principal. The principal oversees their function. I would like to see them obviously devote 900% of their time to doing nothing but working with parents. I have to be very realistic about certain percentage of their time, from our own program needs requires that they spend some time documenting, there is a certain amount of record keeping that they have to do. Since they work with the schools and they are housed at the schools and principals are their supervisors, the needs of their schools have to come before our program's needs and we recognize that. If that person is going to be a useful member of that staff, they have to work with the principal and with the faculty there. A lot of times, in my opinion, they spend too much time doing things that are not directly associated with community work. They fill in for secretaries, they monitor children in the cafeteria, they are collecting donations for PTA carnivals and all of that type of thing. However, when I look at it overall and try to determine their effectiveness in terms of working with the PTA, that is a community type of project and sometimes when they have to transport a sick child home, ok that is another thing that really if we were to stick strictly by guidelines, we would be tempted to say no you can't do that. But we know it affords them an opportunity to get to know the parents and to find out what a situation is, it gives them additional insight that can possibly make them more effective members of that faculty so that, you know, you have to sort of compromise in certain areas.

AM: So they are actually a staff of the school, they are hired by the school.

I: They are hired by the principal.

AM: What is the ethnic breakdown?

I: They are all Mexican-Americans, they are all bilingual.

AM: What are their approximate ages?

I: It varies from about 32 to about 45.

AM: And the sex?

I: All are female

AM: Approximate educational level?

I: All of them with the exception of one has at least a GED, two of them are attending ACC and working beyond their degree. One of my community reps got in a program with St. Edwards and is very close to getting her teachers certificate.

AM: How were they recruited?

I: Initially when we first got started I assisted the personnel person that was interviewing them and we screened them and then we could come up with a certain number of people and would then send them up to be interviewed by the principal. In some instances principals already knew that they needed somebody and they would do their own screening and send those people to personnel.

AM: Now there is 1 per school? And the principal of that school would actually do the hiring.

I: Right, he's actually the one that approves the hiring of a person.

AM: Was there any particular background training or experience . . .

I: No, but the idea that I think that was used by all principals was that they wanted somebody that they felt knew the community, somebody that could relate to the community and somebody that had a facility to talk and to communicate well with people. That was the criteria that was used.

AM: After they were hired, did they have any specific training?

I: Very definitely. I provided the training for the community reps and in addition to what principals might provide additional training for them as well but I meet with them during the summer for 5 full days and I don't do all the training myself, I hire consultants, but I supervise their training. I do alot of their training myself for the different program needs because I know exactly what those need to be and then we have at least 1 inservice a month. On occasion it has been more.

AM: These would be like workshops.

I: Right. And initially the turnover of community reps for our program has been very minimal so I feel very fortunate that we have been able to keep the same persons and the training does not have to be repeated every year but we can proceed from one level to a higher one and initially I provided for them all types of training program orientation, everything from manuscript writing to techniques in reading and reading readiness, math, parenting, even how to put together a little campus newsletter that they need to do and Spanish accents and Spanish composition to a certain degree because they needed to have that. I provided them with dictionaries and all kinds of things because they do so many kinds of things. Really their job is very comprehensive and they are called upon sometimes to act as translators, sometimes to send out notices in Spanish and so I had to kind of see the whole picture and try to provide that training. The most recently type of training they have been receiving is geared to the EBC home intervention program and that they have to become very familiar with those units, the vocabulary, the concepts, the techniques for oral language development and that type of thing. Initially another thing that we did that they really enjoyed and they have enjoyed it so much that I continued it even though I have a little trouble justifying it, is that parents were so hesitant about coming to the school, that we needed to get them there somehow, so we did a lot of arts and crafts, and they loved that you know. And we tied it in a lot of times to making reading games and activities, arts and crafts activities that parents could teach their kids at home to do and that type of things. Relating it to cultural _____ And those have been so successful in that they did bring in the parents in bunches because those are fun kinds of things and from there we proceeded to move them into more sophisticated kinds of involvement but those have been so popular that I dare not include them in our inservice schedule for the year because they enjoy it. We always have an arts and crafts session in December for the Christmas workshops and parents come into the schools, in most schools, I don't require our community reps to have an arts and crafts workshop - they decide whether they want to do it or not. We have monies available to buy a limited amount of materials and parents come and they make all kinds of Christmas decorations and they get to carry some of them home, sometimes they leave them in the school. But the arts and crafts thing is another thing . . . also they have used to make money for school, they use them at carnivals, they get parents to make all kinds of arts and crafts things to sell at the carnivals for the fund raisers at the school. So, indirectly, there has been a good rationale for having them.

AM: Now in the inservice workshops with the community reps what briefly kinds of things do you cover?

I: It depends on what time of the year it is really. At the beginning of the year a lot of training on how to tutor (?) parents in the different areas, how to work with the EBC so that it is very instructional kinds of things. And then sometimes we have consultants that will come in from out of town, particularly if I can get them free now because our consultant account is down to zero - they keep cutting us back every year, and so sometimes I get people to come in from some of the agencies. When I find out that there is a new agency in town and they'll give us some information about what it is that they do and so we always try to include one or two of those a year. We have had sessions in the past on how to conduct home visits and how to follow through on home visits. We did a whole session on how to follow through on

this EBC thing. And so they are geared kind of to work, on what our particular kinds of needs are. Initially, like I said, we did a lot many more specific things because they needed it, in the first, at the beginning of the year and also at the beginning of our project.

AM: Now the 5 day workshop, is that an all-day long intensive training and then there are the inservice . . .

I: And we already have our schedule set up for next year.

AM: You don't repeat the 5 day thing, is that repeated every year?

I: Oh yea, every year it is repeated. And every year we try to include something a little bit different. This year, for the first time, we are coordinating training Title I and Migrant Community Reps and the Title VII Reps will be receiving the same kind of training. And this is a tentative schedule that we are showing the community reps and principals now and its subject to change but this is kind of what we see as a need right now and there will be several of us conducting this type of training for them as a whole. This has been, has received emphasis every year, we feel that that is very important, and they learn some good skills on how to communicate effectively with people and a lot of it has come through, they have done a lot of self-growth, because if they are going to be out there talking to parents and trying to get them to use positive techniques in dealing with children, you have to be very positive yourself, so we've had to do a lot of that kind of self-growth kind of thing and I hired consultants to help us with that.

AM: And then there is the _____ Program.

I: That is something that we may purchase next year. Its a program that is available, its expensive, but I think Title I is thinking of buying it and we'll be able to use it.

AM: OK, so this is a commercially available . . .

I: Its a commerical package that we're thinking of buying, as a group we are thinking of buying it.

AM: And you've been using this?

I: We have not used it yet - it will be new. That is another thing, I always provide training at the beginning of the year on some kind of, I used to have money to buy a commerical program, and if I'm going to use it I want them to be familiar with it so I usually spend a good day in letting them know what's in it and how to use it and that type of thing.

AM: So then this one is particularly community services.

I: Right

AM: And then a session on cultural awareness and a session on coordination between different representatives. You've mentioned some of the different things that you do, is there anything that we haven't covered as far as your activities?

I: Other than supervising the community reps and providing for their training, I'm also in charge of organizing an advisory group and insuring that it meets regularly and insuring that they get program information and have an opportunity to give us their input into . . .

AM: And this is an advisory group . . .

I: Right, made up of representatives from each of our schools. I'm also in charge of editing a newsletter twice a year and maintaining our budget - I have a budget, my component has a budget I have to keep track of and so I guess that is pretty much it in a nutshell.

AM: Now the other 2 staff roles that you mentioned that were involved with the parents would be the instruction staff - who are . . .

I: OK, there are 6 of us up here. We have a staff development person, we have an instructionals person, a learning specialist and a curriculum development specialist. On occasion they have assisted me in providing training for _____ in particular areas. If I have a group of parents or a group of teachers that have requested to have volunteers that can tutor children in a particular area, their area of expertise I feel is much sharper than mine in that area and many times I've gone to their assistance and they have provided demonstrations, live demonstrations with children for the parents to see and so they have assisted in that way.

AM: Would this be primarily through the workshops?

I: Yea, it happens usually at the beginning of the year when we are doing that training for the parent volunteers in the classroom.

AM: OK so they would be primarily in contact with the parent volunteers, OK, and there are, how many did you say?

I: There are 4 people, aside from our coordinator and our coordinator has also provided that type of training.

AM: What percentage of their time would be involved?

I: I would say probably 3% or 4%.

AM: And what is the ethnic breakdown?

I: Of our staff, we have 1 A (1 aide?).

AM: And the approximate ages.

I: I'd say from 34 to about 48.

AM: And sex breakdown.

I: We have 1 male.

AM: And the approximate educational level.

I: Everybody has a Masters at least. We have 2 ladies with Supervisors Certificates, 3 of us are working on a Supervisors Certificate and we have

one lady with an Administrative Certificate.

AM: Was there any specific training for the, say the consulting that they did?

I: Not really, they just received an idea as to what it was that was needed and that type of thing and proceeded from that.

AM: And now the coordinator in direct contact with parents would be primarily this kind of activity.

I: Right, exactly. I feel that every single one of our staff members is elite in their field or real experts in that they can provide just about any type of training. They are involved in teacher training and so they have been able to assist in the other. All of them are former classroom teachers.

AM: I'd like to ask you your opinion about general characteristics that you feel are real important for people in the various staff positions. Are there any personal traits that you find that are especially important for people in contact with the parents, like I guess primarily the community reps.

I: Yea, I think that they really need to feel a real love and an interest in people. I think they need to feel that parents are very important people and that they are the child's primary teacher and that we need to, all of our approaches to parents have to be from that premise - they can't be negative and critical and looking down at parents - these are characteristics that not any of us can afford to have if we are going to have an effective parental involvement program. So I think its recognizing parents as people who care for their children and have rights and who want to learn and help their children. We believe that parents are that way and go from that approach.

AM: Do you think that there are any specific types of skills or background training that would be important for this.

I: For parental involvement specialists, for someone working with parents? I think you have to have an awareness of community. I think you need to, if you're going to be successful you need to know the political climate of the community, you need to be familiar with the language, the dialect of the community, you need to be able to have experienced the same kind of thing, but you need to be familiar enough so that you don't come into community with a bunch of theories that you've never tried anywhere and expect to try em out here because its not going to work that way. You've got to know where those people are coming from and it has to be a realistic version of that because sometimes we tend to . . . I think one of the big faults with a lot of parental involvement programs is that we think we know what people need and a lot of times we are reading them all the way wrong and people, you know, they'll accept you but they look at you as, you know, I'll put up with this person here because I have to. You have to have a certain amount of believability about you and the only way you can have that is to really understand what is in that community.

AM: One of the other questions was were any of the staff brought from the local community and I think you answered that, the community representatives . . .

I: Yea, they are all from the local community, all with the exception of one, two people. Initially we worked out of 14 schools and so we had schools that were kind of in the outskirts, we had schools in north Austin and northwest and northeast Austin and so we hired people from those communities for those schools. The following year 6 of those schools were cut from our program and we wound up with schools in high concentrations of bilingual communities - east and south. Since those people had been hired as Title VII people we really felt a need to place them in the schools, so we have two community reps that are working in two schools in east Austin that do not live in the community.

AM: So you have 9 schools total in your program?

I: We have 10 schools but one of them is a 6th Grade Center and we don't have a full-time community rep there.

AM: Could you name the schools?

I: Allison, Becker, Brook, Dawson, Govalle, Metz, Ortega, Sanchez, Travis Heights and Zavalla.

AM: I'd like to get sort of a brief history of the program so we can get some idea of the . . . When was the program started?

I: It was started in 74-75. Yea, 74.

AM: Who funded the program initially?

I: HEW

AM: And that is the same funding now. Approximately, how much is the operating budget?

I: It started out close to a million dollars, it was $900,000 something and by now it is, you know you get cut backs every year, right now we are somewhere in the vacinity of about $650,000 or maybe $700,000 - I don't know the exact figures.

AM: How long is the current funding period?

I: We operated 1 year, the following year we submitted an application for a 5 year grant, and we got it, so this is our 3rd year of that 5 year grant.

AM: So with that period of time you don't expect the funding level to change.

I: Oh yea, it will change. We are expecting a cut this year, we don't know how much but we know we'll have to do some shifting around.

AM: Sort of in general, why was the program started.

I: There was a need for a bilingual program in Austin - there was not one and political pressures from the community, I think, brought an awareness to the district that they needed to do something about it. They actually started a bilingual program here in Austin - an effort was made - even before the Title, the federal programs, came into operation. Of course now its mandated and they have to have it _____ free. It was started I think as a result of political pressures by the community.

AM: Which was put down a district, which responded . . .

I: The district responded at that time with a very, very small token budget. I think in that first year they were in operation they had a budget of about $60,000, if that much. They had one person that was coordinating the whole thing throughout the whole school. The following year . . .

AM: This was the bilingual program itself or . . .

I: This was the district's attempt to start a bilingual program.

AM: About when was this?

I: This was 2 years before federal funding came so I would say it was like in 1970 or thereabouts. Now prior to that there had been a bilingual program out of Title VII to Region XIII at one campus here in Austin. But the district had not committed any money to it and then from that of course federal funding the ESA program for 2 years, Title VII came the 2nd year, during ESA's 2nd year and also the school district has budgeted now I think its $454,000 for, into the bilingual department, so we do have - every year we seem to getting a little bit more committment from the district.

AM: In terms of the parent involvement portion, when, how was that started?

I: That began in our particular program it was a federal mandate in order for you to get federal monies you have to have a community involvement component and now the format for the component was written in by the writers of the application at that time and it included a specialist with community reps.

AM: So the onset of this program was based on the mandate. It was started up by submission of a proposal which included the community representatives. Have there been any major changes since its conception?

I: If you're talking about Title VII - no. If we're talking about federal funds, ESA only had 4 community reps and they worked out of 4 schools. When Title VII came in it encompassed many more schools, more community reps, more personnel, more money. Since the inception of Title VII, the community involvement component has remained basically the same. There have been a few cut backs, like I mentioned consultants, our newsletter account has been cut back, our travel account - all components have to cut a certain percentage out and we have to figure out where to do it.

I'm glad that community reps are still with us. There was a question last year as to whether all of those positions would be funded or not and we had to really fight to get them so [illegible] . . .

AM: So since the parent involvement component started in 74, it stayed primarily the same. Have there been any particular factors that have helped in the development of the program?

I: I think the primary factor that has really given us a lot of help is that the people that are in our program - principals and teachers - have had some real positive feelings about parents and the assistance that community reps have given them at their schools have been very positive and I don't think too many of them want to do away with their community reps because they consider them a real asset to the campus. So I think that has been very positive.

AM: Have there been any particular factors that have hindered?

I: I'm sure there are some. One of the things that we have a lot of difficulty with is, we touched on it a little while ago, when it comes to all federal servants you have to be so accountable for every single penny that you get. In parental involvement it is very difficult to measure things like that - like increased interest on the parents, those types of things and I think when it comes to attitudes of parents and how those things affect children's learning, I think that that is a process that takes time - I don't think its something that you can short change and our evaluation component is a pretty strict one and a year ago we fell short of meeting one of our objectives. We were supposed to have so many people come in to the classroom and assist the teacher and this and that and the other and there were supposed to be so many parents - numbers, you know - and we didn't meet that objective and we got really lambasted by several people in the administration. But principals and teachers were so supportive and so upset over those evaluations that they insisted on changing some of the objectives because they say, sure you're measuring how many parents are coming into the classroom to assist, those that didn't forget to sign in that teachers didn't forget to report, but how do you measure the increased gains, how do you measure the attitudes of parents, how do you measure our increase in school functions and so they have been very supportive. I guess I would say the one negative thing is that its very difficult to evaluate the results that we have had because I think they are long range results.

AM: It sounds like you have really generated a lot of support within the schools . . .

I: I feel that we have, I really feel that we have to a great, you know, I think that unless _____ the program is perfect and I don't want to paint a big rosey picture, we have our problems on some campuses, our problems are more serious than on others, and we don't have as many parents as we'd have to, obviously, you know we are always trying to get more and more, but I think generally speaking the support is there.

AM: Was there any resistance in the schools?

I: There isn't now. Initially when we had 14 schools and some of them were located on campuses that were not in the east Austin area, there was a lot, a lot of resistance.

AM: From teachers?

I: From teachers and parents.

AM: What would you say is the amount of community support that you feel . .

I: I feel that if bilingual education were in danger of not being funded, not progressing the way we know it needs to progress, that we would have the community behind us in a minute. I feel that they are very supportive, I feel that most parents want their children to have bilingual education - that was another question that we asked on a questionnaire earlier - some parents don't want their children to learn Spanish cause they don't understand bilingual education. A lot of them come from Mexico and say, I want my child to learn English - He already knows Spanish. So we have some parents that are negative but I think those are very few - the percentage is very small.

AM: What kinds of community support do you sense specifically for the parent involvement program?

I: I think that its there. I think that one of the big hassles was that when community reps were, they were discussing dropping the community reps or cutting the positions from 9 to something like 4, our community became very upset and we got a lot of support. So I feel that they really have appreciated and do support em.

AM: Do you have, for people who might be interested in setting up a similar parent involvement program, do you have materials that you distribute or . . .

I: Well, for somebody first beginning to start out, I've got a lot of questionnaires, a lot of organizational types of ideas and tips, structures on particular activities that can be done

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 East 7th Street, Austin, Texas 78701

512/476-6861

_____
_____
_____

Dear _____:

The Division of Family and Community Studies of the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory is currently conducting an in-depth study of ongoing parent education programs. We see parent education as a much-needed and valuable service; therefore, in order to get some idea as to what is being done in this regard, e.g., who is doing parent education, how is it being done, what kind of funding is being utilized, who are the consumers, etc., we are mailing the attached questionnaire to key people in selected programs located in your area. Please complete and return it in two weeks.

All data collected will be kept in strict confidence.

Thank you for your time and thoroughness in answering the enclosed questionnaire.

Sincerely,

_____
_____
_____

Enclosure

SEDL

APPENDIX F

Drafts of Instruments:

Program Description Questionnaire
Parent Education Program Staff Questionnaire
Parent Education Leader Interview Topics

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

I. IDENTIFICATION

Respondent's Name: _____ _____
(Last) (First)

Job Title: _____

Agency Name: _____

Address: _____
Street City State Zip

Parent Education Program Name: _____

Please check if program does not have a name separate from that of the agency: _____

II. AGENCY

Please briefly describe the general purpose of the agency: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Excluding parent education, are there any other activities carried out by the agency specifically for parents?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

I. IDENTIFICATION

Respondent's Name: _____ _____
(Last) (First)

Job Title: _____

Agency Name: _____

Address: _____
Street City State Zip

Parent Education Program Name: _____

Please check if program does not have a name separate from that of the agency: ____

II. AGENCY

Please briefly describe the general purpose of the agency: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Excluding parent education, are there any other activities carried out by the agency specifically for parents?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

III. PARENT EDUCATION PROGRAM

A. Please check those activities which are carried out in the parent education program and list any others:

1. ___Home Visits
2. ___Lecture Series/Course
3. ___Discussion Group/Group Meetings
4. ___Workshop
5. ___Participation in Classroom/School
6. ___Individual or Single Family Counseling
7. ___Group Therapy
8. ___Others (specify):_____

_____

B. For each activity indicated above, please complete the questions on the left vertical column of the chart.

| QUESTIONS | ACTIVITY #__ | ACTIVITY #__ | ACTIVITY #__ | ACTIVITY #__ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| What are the general procedures for the activity? | | | | |
| What are the topics or the content? | | | | |
| What is the frequency? Duration? | | | | |
| What are the specific objectives? | | | | |
| How many staff? Parents? | | | | |

C. Please answer the following questions about the program participants. Check those methods used for recruitment and list any others:

___Newspaper
___Television
___Word of Mouth
___Posters
___Brochures/Announcements
___Other Agency Referrals (specify):_____

_____

___Other Methods
___Other Methods (specify):_____

_____

___No Method, parents contact the program

If no recruitment methods are used, how do you thing parents find out about the program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Can anyone attend the program? ___Yes ___No

Please describe the parents who participate in the program by indicating approximate percentages in the space provided. (For example: the program may be designed for anyone, but actual participants are "90% mothers and 10% couples", and "100% middle income".)

___Teenage Parents
___Low Income
___Middle or Upper Income
___Parents of Handicapped
___Mothers
___Couples
___Single Parents

___Specific ethnic group (specify:)_____
___Specific language group (specify:)_____
___Parents of specific Age or Grade-Level Child (specify:)_____
___Other (specify:)_____

What is the approximate total number of participants involved in the programs at any given time?_____

D. Please check those positions or job titles that apply to your parent education program and indicate how many there are of each.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ___Coordinator | ___ | ___Home Visitor | ___ |
| ___Administrator | ___ | ___Secretary | ___ |
| ___Parent-Trainers | ___ | ___Consultant | ___ |
| ___Nurse | ___ | ___Volunteers | ___ |
| ___Doctor | ___ | ___Community Aide | ___ |
| ___Psychologists | ___ | ___Counselor | ___ |
| ___Social Worker | ___ | ___Other (Specify:) _____ | ___ |

PARENT EDUCATION PROGRAM
STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

Name:_____Title/Position:_____

Age:_____ Sex:___Male ___Female Ethnic Group: _____

Educational Level:_____

Agency Name:_____Address:_____

Parent Education Program Name:_____

Please briefly describe your job duties in the parent education program:

_____

_____

_____

_____

Approximately what percentage of your time within the agency is devoted to functions related to the parent education program?_ _____

Approximately what percentage of your time is spent in direct parent training contact?

_____ _____

What kinds of background training or experiences did you have relevant to parent education before being hired in your current position? For how many years?

_____

_____

_____

Did the program provide you with any training for working with parents? ___Yes ___No

IF YES, please explain: (a) the nature of the training, (b) the duration of the training, and (c) identification of the trainer.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

PARENT EDUCATION LEADER INTERVIEW TOPICS

The following list of topics should be incorporated into an interview schedule:

1. Individual demographic data (age, sex, ethnicity, education level, parenting status).

2. Background training and experiences relevant to parent education prior to entering the field.

3. Number of years and types of experiences within the field of Parent Education.

4. Current employment, job title, job duties.

5. Training provided for Parent Education in current position.

6. Own assessment of own strengths as parent educator.

7. Own assessment of own weakensses and needs as parent educator.

8. Beliefs about personal traits and skills necessary for parent educators in general.

9. Beliefs about current needs and training experiences to upgrade quality of Parent Education.

10. Beliefs about hinderances/factors that promote or support Parent Education, impact of Parent Education on parents, children, communities, degree of community support and reasons, unmet community needs.

11. Future projections of parent education.